Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

THESES

1939

VOLUME FOUR

34436

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF CLEMENT

by

Tadao Aiura

B.A., Southern Methodist University, 1935
M.A., Pacific School of Religion, 1938
B.D., Southern Methodist University, 1937

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

Graduate Theological Union
LIBRARY

Thesis

Submitted in the

Department of New Testament
Literature and Interpretation

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

in the

Pacific School of Religion

1939

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/oldtestamentquot00unse

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF CLEMENT

by

Tadao Aiura

B.A., Southern Methodist University, 1928
M.A., Pacific School of Religion, 1936
B.D., Southern Methodist University, 1937

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

Thesis

Submitted in the

Department of New Testament
Literature and Interpretation

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

in the

Pacific School of Religion

1939

TO Y. A.

whose continued assistance and
encouragement have made this
work possible

FOREWORD

I would express my most sincere appreciation to Professor McCown and Dean Muilenburg: to the former for suggesting the subject of this dissertation, which has proved to be fascinating and rewarding, and for his valuable suggestions and criticisms; to the latter for his unfailing interest and encouragement throughout the preparation of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

I. PROLEGOMENA 1

A. History of the Problem 1
E. Hatch, H. B. Swete

B. Short Account of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians 7
1. Date, 2. Authorship, 3. Genuineness and Integrity

C. The Manuscripts and Versions 19
1. Codex Alexandrinus, 2. Codex Constantinopolitanus, 3. The Syriac Version, 4. The Latin Version, 5. The Coptic Version, 6. Their Characteristics

D. Quotations in the Early Christian Writers 26
1. Barnabas, 2. Ignatius, 3. Polycarp, 4. Hermas, 5. II Clement, 6. Justin Martyr, 7. Letter of the Smyrnaeans, 8. Clement of Alexandria, 9. Origen, *et al.*

Notes on I. Prolegomena 34

II. OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN CLEMENT 37

A. Table of Old Testament Passages Quoted in Clement 37

B. Formulas of Citation 43

C. Old Testament Quotations in Clement 45

D. Symbols and Abbreviations 48

E. Discussion of the Quotations 51

Notes on II. Old Testament Quotations in Clement 150

Page
III. CONCLUSION 153
CHARTS
1. Quotations and their Characteristics . . . 160
2. Formula Citandi and Degree of Accuracy 164
BIBLIOGRAPHY 166
INDEX (Patristic and Biblical Passages) 173

I. PROLEGOMENA

A. HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

Early quotations from the LXX, whether in the New Testament or in the Greek Fathers, are a considerable aid in the textual criticism of the LXX, which in turn contributes to the study of the text of the Old Testament.

The quotations from the LXX in the New Testament have been examined by Toy and Johnson.[1] But "the quotations," to use the words of Hatch, "from the LXX in the Greek Fathers are almost unworked field."[2] These words were written by him in 1888, but the condition was about the same even when Swete published his *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* twelve years after.

Since 1900, so far as we know, no work on the problem has been published. The reason for this somewhat astonishing phenomenon is simple. This field cannot be worked with satisfactory results, unless we have a reliable collation of the MSS of the author whose quotations are to be examined, and of the MSS of the LXX. Fortunately the Apostolic Fathers can now be used with confidence in the editions of Lightfoot, Gebhardt-Harnack-Zahn, and Lake.

Before we proceed with our study, we will briefly trace the work which has been done in this field. Hatch set forth, in his *Essays*, a method in dealing with early quotations of the Old Testament. First, the MSS readings of a given passage of the Old Testament (LXX) may be compared with the quotations of it. The benefit of this procedure is twofold: (1) it enables us to determine the value of the MSS, according as they do or do not agree with such early quotations, (2) it furnishes us a clue to the history of its exegesis.

Secondly, the quotations in a given writer may be gathered together and scrutinized. By this means we can ascertain approximately the text which was in use in his time, and we can also learn the mode of his quotation of the scriptures. This last item is important, because we are able to appreciate thereby the value of the contributions which his quotations make to textual criticism.

In order to illustrate his method, Hatch quotes from the Sixtine edition a text of Genesis or Exodus, adding a short *apparatus criticus*, taken from Holmes and Parsons, and from Lagarde. It is followed by the quotations found in Philo, the New Testament, the Apostolic Fathers, and Justin Martyr. Sometimes the early Latin versions are also used. The second part of his method is well exemplified by gathering together the quotations of two Old Testament books,

the Psalms and Isaiah, in Philo, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, and Justin Martyr, and by estimating their possible value for the criticism or exegesis of the LXX.

Our particular interest is centered around his notes on the following quotations in Clement of Rome: XXXIII.5 ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμαίωσιν ἡμετέραν (Genesis I.28). He says:

> The passage is critically interesting on several grounds: (1) The change in the position of the pronoun in Clement, Barnabas, and the early Latin Fathers can hardly be ascribed to accident or inexact quotation. The controversial importance of the pronoun is shown by the Gnostic controversies, Epiphan. *Haeres.* 23.1,5. The critical importance of the passage lies in the indication which it furnishes of the existence of well-established readings outside the existing MSS of the LXX, and of the small influence which early patristic citations exercised upon MSS of the LXX. (2) The Hebrew has the pronoun with both words, and there is a trace of a Hebraizing revision of the LXX in the Paris and Vatican MSS of Origen *in Joann.* 13.28 (IV.238) κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν: so also in the Coptic, Sahidic, and some MSS of the Arabic, and in the quotation in S. Ambros. *Hexaem.* 6.7 . . . . But of this revision there is no trace in existing MSS of the LXX.[3]

Some accounts of a similar nature are given to other quotations, X.2 (Genesis XII.1-3), X.6 (Genesis XV.5,6), XVII.2 (Genesis XVIII.27), IV.10 (Exodus II.13,14). We shall have occasion to come back to these notes later. As to the quotations from the Psalms in Clement of Rome, Hatch concludes that in general there is a precise agreement

between the quotations and the current text of the LXX, the variations being only such as exist between different MSS of the LXX, and that the quotations of Clement must be esteemed highly for their contribution to the determination of the text of the LXX. Clement's quotations from the Psalms, which he studied, are Ps L (LI).3-19, Ps LXI (LXII).5, Ps XXXI (XXXII).1,2, Ps XXXVI (XXXVII).35-37, and Ps XLV (L). 16-23.

Clement's quotations from Isaiah, except composite ones, according to Hatch, are for the most part faithful reproductions of the LXX text, and in several cases afford interesting contributions to the criticism of it. As examples, he cites Is XXIX.13, Is LIII, and Is LX.17. Composite quotations constitute a special problem, and Hatch devotes a whole chapter to its discussion in his *Essays in Biblical Greek*. It is highly probable, he believes, that the Greek-speaking Jews had, among other books, manuals of morals, of devotion, and of controversy. In the course of time, they must have begun to make collections of excerpts. The existence of composite quotations in the New Testament, and in some of the early Fathers suggests the possibility that we have in them relics of such excerpts.[4] This conjecture explains many problems involved in composite quotations better than any other. Hatch rejects the view held by many that they are mere misquotations in which the

writers have, through defect of memory, blended several passages into one. The character of the quotations which they make from the Old Testament opposes this hypothesis. Such quotations in general are made with great accuracy. The existence of a disagreement between them and the existing MSS points not to an inaccuracy on the part of the writers but to a variation in the currect text. The view that such combinations of passages might have been made by any writer who was familiar with the text of the Old Testament is rendered improbable by the fact that in some cases the same, or nearly the same, combinations occur in diferent writers. Hatch cites two instances, namely (1) the composite quotation, Jer II. 12,13 + Is XVI. 1,2, which is found in both Barnabas XI. 2,3, and in Justin Martyr, *Tryph.* 114; (2) the composite quotation from the Psalms and Isaiah, which is found in the New Testament, Romans III. 10-18, and in Justin Martyr, *Tryph.* 27.

Hatch did not claim to have presented a comprehensive work on the early quotations from the Greek Old Testament. It was a provisional one. Nevertheless it had prepared the way for those who would follow him in his vast and fascinating field, and we find in Swete his worthy successor. In one of the chapters in his *Introduction* Swete discusses Clement's quotations of the Old Testament. After a careful study of the exact or nearly exact quotations of

the LXX in Clement, he reached the following conclusion:

> (a) Clement's text of the LXX inclines in places to that which appears in the N.T., and yet presents sufficient evidence of independence; (b) as between the texts of the LXX represented by B and A, while often supporting A, it is less constantly opposed to B than is the New Testament; and (c) it displays an occasional tendency to agree with Theodotion and even with Aquila against the LXX. It seems in fact to be a more mixed text than that which was in the hands of the Palestinian writers of the N.T.[5]

Unfortunately his treatment of the subject is insufficient in length and in materials. It is limited to a survey of only one half of the total number of the quotations from the Old Testament in Clement.[6] As to the method he employed, we have no means to know. In this sense, the work of Swete, invaluable as it is, may be called also a provisional one. We are now in need of a more comprehensive study in this field, and the present work is a mere attempt to meet such a demand.

B. SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS

The letter of the Roman Church to the Corinthian Church which has come down to us under the title of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians is one of the most important witnesses for the development of the faith and life of the Gentile Christian churches in the post-apostolic period. Wendland describes the character of this Epistle thus, "Dieser Brief ist durchaus ein Kunstprodukt, dem niemand den literarischen Charakter absprechen kann, und er is doch ein wirklichen Brief."[7] This mixed form is also recognized by Stählin and Schmid.[8] Its purpose was the re-establishment of peace and order in the Church of Corinth. It consists of 65 chapters, and may be divided into two parts. The first part (I-XXXVIII) contains many moral considerations, which were meant to prepare the minds of the Corinthians for the advice and the exhortation which are given to them in the second part (XXXIX-LXV).

1. Date

Patrick Young, the first editor of Clement's Epistle (A.D. 1633), placed the date of this document about the close of the reign of Domitian or immediately after, e.g. A.D. 95,96.[9] This view has been accepted by critics of diverse schools, such as Junius, Cotelier, Tillemont,

Giseler, Rothe, Ritschl, Gundert, Lipsius, Tischendorf, Gebhardt and Harnack, Lightfoot,[10] Uhlhorn,[11] and Knopf.[12] This date has been held by Crutwell,[13] Bardenhewer,[14] Chapman,[15] and Marsh.[16] Harnack too assigns the Epistle to this period. He says, "Die äusseren und inneren Gründe stimmen . . . . vortrefflich überein; unser Brief ist am Ende der Regierungszeit Domitian's zwischen c. 93-95 geschrieben, schwerlich erst 96 oder 97."[17] Grieve and Robinson (*Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition*) are more definite, assigning it to A.D. 96, and Goodspeed, in one of his recent works, maintains this date.[18]

Thus this view, which was first put forward by Young, has now become so general that it may be regarded as the received opinion. On the other hand there are some writers, such as Grotius, Grabe, Wotton, Hefele, and Wieseler, who assign it as early as the close of Nero's reign (A.D. 64-68).[19] A few extreme critics such as Schwegler, Volkmar, Baur, Keim, and Pfleiderer, have placed it in the reign of Trajan or of Hadrian or even later.[20] Recently Merrill opposed the accepted opinion and said that it was not written by Clement, Bishop of Rome, and that no such person existed.[21] He placed it about A.D. 140, shortly before the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

In order to determine the date we must resort to both external and internal evidence. The external testimony

is very favorable to the received dates, as against the earlier and later ones. Hegesippus and Irenaeus alike mention their visit to Rome, where they seem to have stayed a considerable time, when the memory of Clement was still fresh. The words of Hegesippus concerning Clement, which are recorded in Eusebius *H.E.*, are not altogether clear. If the phrase, "st the time mentioned" (κατὰ τὸν δηλούμενον), refers to Domitian, then we have the direct statement of this writer in support of the accepted view. But, even if it does not, Hegesippus must have expressed himself in such a way as to make Eusebius understand it so. At any rate we receive the same impression from the fragments preserved in *H.E.*, III.16.

Furthermore, Hegesippus gives a list of the bishops of Rome in order of succession. He seems to place Clement in the last decade of the first century. The same witness is presented by Irenaeus, who places Clement third in the order of succession. The description of the relations of Clement and his contemporaries and the Apostles, as it is geven by Irenaeus, does not agree with a date so early as Nero, or so late as Hadrian.

The internal evidence favorable to the accepted date is stronger than the external evidence. (1) Concerning the bearers of the letter, the writer says, "we have

sent faithful and prudent men, who have lived among us without blame from youth to old age, and they shall be witnesses between you and us"(LXIII.3). The first Apostle arrived in Rome about A.D. 60, and began to preach the Gospel. Even if we admit the existence of the Roman congreation a few years before A.D. 56 (an approximate date for *Romans*), it would have been impossible for any young man to grow in the Church of Christ to old age by the time of Nero.

(2) The Epistle states that "it is not just to remove from their ministry those who were appointed by them (the Apostles), or later on by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered to the flock of Christ without blame, humbly, peaceably, and disinterestedly, and for many years have received a universally favorable testimony."(XLIV.3) This passage together with XLVI.2 witnesses the fact that in the Church of Corinth already the presbyters have succeeded their predecessors, who had been appointed by the Apostles and had now "fallen asleep." If the Epistle was written about A.D. 68 or earlier, it would allow only sixteen years for a long succession, for the narrative in the Acts will permit us to place the appointment of a regular ministry at Corinth only about A.D. 52. It would contradict the account of the Epistle.[22]

(3) The Epistle also states that it is shameful

that "on account of one or two persons the steadfast and *ancient church* of the Corinthians is being disloyal to the presbyters."(XLVII.6) It is noteworthy that the Church of Corinth is already called "ancient." Lightfoot says, "This epithet seems not to be consistent with the very early date which some critics would assign to Clement's epistle."[23]

(4) Besides the definite reference to the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, we can trace easily the influence of several other Pauline Epistles, the Epistle of James, the First Epistle of Peter. The expressions taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews are numerous, the fact of which is now generally recognized by New Testament scholars, including Moffatt,[24] Goodspeed,[25] and Dibelius.[26] Now the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed after A.D. 80 by almost all modern scholars.[27] Therefore it is impossible that the Epistle of Clement was written in Nero's reign (A.D. 64-68).

One argument appears at first sight formidable in favor of the early date. It is based on the description of the sacrifices and the temple-worship at Jerusalem given in XLI.2. The present tense there employed leads one to suppose that the writer of the Epistle had no knowledge of the catastrophe which had overtaken the hly city under Vespasion and Titus. "However," says Lightfoot, "this mode of speaking was common long after the destruction of the temple

and the cessation of the sacrifices, so that no argument respecting date can be founded on it."[28]

On the other hand, the Epistle cannot have been written later than the end of the first century for the following reasons. (1) We find in XLIV.4,5 that ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος are still regarded as interchangeable terms, whereas very early in the second century in the Epistles of Ignatius the two words are employed to denote two distinct offices of the ministry.

(2) The accounts of the persecutions in Clement's Epistle point the same direction. There are two persecutions mentioned: One refers unmistakably to the troubles of Nero's reign. In one place (V.1) it states, "But, to cease from the examples of old time, let us come to those who contended in the days nearest to us; let us take the noble examples of our own generation." By "the noble examples" of martyrdom, it means Peter and Paul, who, universal tradition says, suffered under Nero. The other persecution is spoken of as if it was now raging or had been raging very recently, when the Epistle was written. All the early Christian writers, according to Lightfoot, speak of the first persecution under Nero and the second under Domitian. This is the case not only with Eusebius, but with Melito, Tertullian, and Lactantius. Thus the Epistle cannot have been written much earlier or later than the

end of Domitian's reign. Dibelius, in *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, supports this view and says:

> It (the Epistle of Clement) belongs to a particular moment of time, for, according to the beginning of the letter, it is looking back upon a persecution which had just ended but which is later than that of Nero. But as we have not yet reached the time of Hermas (cf. Section 15) with its special circumstances in Rome, the only persecution which comes into account is the end of that under Domitian (A.D. 95-6).[29]

Volkmar, who adopts the latest date, finds his chief argument in the reference in LV.4 to the apocryphal book of Judith.[30] This book was assigned by him to the reign of Hadrian, and in this he has been followed by Baur, Keim, and others. But his argument is no longer valid, because the Book of Judith is now placed about the middle of the second century B.C. by ractically all scholars.[31]

2. Authorship

Closely related with the question of the date of this Epistle is the question of the authorship. It is traditionally ascribed to Clement, who was, according to the early episcopal lists, the third or fourth bishop of Rome during the last decades of the first century. But the Epistle nowhere claims to have written by him. On the contrary, it is sent in the name of a church, not of an

individual. Is the common designation at fault? Knopf says:

> I Clem. gibt sich von Anfang bis zu Ende als ein Schreiben der römischen Gesamtgemeinde, die vom ersten bis zum letzten Satze in der ersten Person der Mehrzahl redet. In der Ueberlieferung geht der Brief aber unter dem Namen eines bestimmten einzelnen Mannes, des Clemens, dessen Namen freilich nirgends in dem Briefe gennant wird: aber als τὴν διὰ Κλήμεντας γραφεῖσαν (ἐπιστολὴν ὑμῶν) bezeichnet schon Dinonysius von Korinth bei Euseb. Kircheng. IV.23, 11 den I Clem. Die Ueberlieferung kann sehr wohr im Rechte sein. Wenn der Brief auch im Namen der römischen Gemeinde geschrieben ist, so ist er doch von einem einzelnen hervorragenden Manne verfasst, wie schon der streng einheitliche Stil beweist, und der Verfasser mag sehr wohl Clemens geheissen haben; es war das ein Mann, der in der Zeit der zweiten Generation zu den Führern der römischen Gemeinde gehörte und der in der späteren Ueberlieferung als der zweite oder dritte Bischof von Rom erscheint. Leider wissen wir über ihn nichts näheres.[32]

Lake agrees with him, saying, "There is no reason for rejecting this tradition, for though it is not supported by any corroborative evidence in its favor there is nothing whatever against it."[33] Whether or not Clement, Bishop of Rome, was the actual author we cannot be sure. Whoever may have written it, we may be safe to say with Lightfoot, "the historical value of the document will remain for the most part unaffected" as long as it has been firmly established

that it was written during the last decade of the first century and with the authority of the Roman Church.[34]

Martin Dibelius lately cast light on this question from the viewpoint of *Formgeschichte*. In his *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, he says that the Epistle "was undoubtedly composed by a single person as can be seen in a certain unity of content and style."[35] He further finds the style is markedly rhetorical, which gives one the suspicion that the author was of some significance. Before Dibelius, Philip Schaff had noticed this too, for he says in his *History of the Christian Church*, "His Epistle betrays a man of classical culture, executive wisdom, and thorough familiarity with the Septuagint Bible. The last seems to indicate that he was of Jewish parentage."[36] Renan thinks that the author of our Epistle was a Roman Jew. Lemme and Lightfoot are of the same opinion. Uhlhorn however maintains that acquaintance with the Greek Old Testament is possible for a Gentile Christian, because Justin Martyr had the same familiarity with the Old Testament, though he was a Gentile by birth and education. Uhlhorn's view is supported by Harnack, Wrede, and others, and is much more acceptable.

3. Genuineness and integrity

The discussion of the date and authorship has as-

sured us that there is no room for doubt as to the genuineness of the document. Few writings of antiquity are witnessed by so many and various testimonies. Hegesippus visited Corinth and Rome in succession about half a century after Clement's death. He says:

> And the church of Corinth continued in the true faith, until Primus was bishop there. With whom I had familiar conversation, (as I passed many days at Corinth) when I was on the point of sailing to Rome, during which time also we were mutually refreshed in the true doctrine. After coming to Rome, I made my stay with Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus.[37]

If Eusebius' account (*H.E.* III.16) is right, Hegesippus bears witness to the fact that the letter was read publicly from time to time in the Church of Corinth, for the account reads, "This we know to have been publicly read for common benefit, in most of the churches, both in former times and in our own; and that at the time mentioned a sedition did take place at Corinth, is abundantly attested by Hegesippus."

Eusebius (*H.E.* IV.23) refers to a letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the Romans, in which the latter mentions that of Clement to the Corinthians, "showing that it was the practice to read it in the churches, even from the earliest time." Thus two writers mentions the same thing.

Besides these, there are numerous expressions derived from it in the Epistle of Polycarp written only a few years

later. At the close of the century Clement of Alexandria made frequent quotations and references from the letter of his namesake, thus guaranteeing not only the existence of the Epistle, but also the identity of form.[38] In general its genuineness has never been questioned seriously.

On the other hand the integrity of parts has been questioned at certain times and on verious grounds. Only outstanding objections and answers may be discussed here. Soon after the first edition of the printed text of Clement was published, Hieronymus Bignonius expressed his suspicion that there were some things unworthy of the disciple of an Apostle.[39] He could not believe that such a thing as the story of the phoenix should have been written by a learned, devout Christian like Clement. As a matter of fact, this is one of the best authenticated passages of the Epistle. Moreover since men of greater intellect and learning than Clement believed it, it in no way disparages the spiritual authority of the writer's argument.

E. Bernard, following Bignonius, claimed to have detected marked traces of a later hand which had inserted into the text of Clement of Rome some fragments of Clement of Alexandria, who quoted him.[40] This claim, Lightfoot thinks, is hardly worth refutation. Later Mosheim and Neander attacked XL and the following chapters, the former

because of an interruption of the argument, and the latter on the ground of its sacerdotalism.[41] More recently Jacobi and Overbeck raised question whether the liturgical portion at the close was any part of the original text of the Epistle, and suggested that it was interpolated afterwards at Corinth. Lightfoot meets this question as follows: "It is contained in both our authorities CS, and obviously was contained in A, before the missing leaf disappeared, as the space shows."[42]

In this present work, the genuineness and integrity of the document are accepted as established. As to the actual writer or writers we are not certain, but for the sake of convenience the letter which is commonly called the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians will be called simply *Clement*.

C. THE MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS

The sources for the text of the Epistle of Clement are as follows:

Codex Alexandrinus

Codex Constantinopolitanus

The Syriac Version

The Latin Version

The Coptic Version

For the following description of the MSS and Versions I am indebted to Lightfoot, Lake, and Cruttwell:

1. In Codex Alexandrinus (A) the two Epistles of Clement stand at the close of the New Testament immediately after the Apocalypse and probably were regarded as canonical. The edges of the leaves are worn in many places so that words or parts of words have occasionally disappeared. In addition to this, a leaf is wanting towards the close of the First Epistle, between LVII and LXIII (LVII.7 ἀνθ' ὧν γὰρ ἠδίκουν . . . . LXIII.4 ὑμᾶς εἰρηωεῦσαι.).

2. Codex Constantinopolitanus (C) was first published at the close of the Year 1875 at Constantinople, bearing the title: *The two Epistles of our holy father Clement Bishop of Rome to the Corinthians; from a manuscript in the Library of the most Holy Sepulhre in Fanar of Constantinople; now for the first time published complete, with prolegomena and notes, by Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan*

of Serrae. Constantinople, 1875. The codex is an octavo volume, written on parchment in cursive characters, and consists of 120 leaves. At the end of the volume is given the date A.M. 6564 according to the Byzantine reckoning. This date corresponds to A.D. 1056, and therefore it may be taken as the date of the completion of the MS. At first this MS was designated I (Ἱεροσολυμιτικός) by Bryennios, and by Hilgenfeld after him. But it is called C (Constantinopolitanus) by Lightfoot, Gebhardt and Harnack, and Lake. It is now preserved in the library of the Great Greek Monastery at Jerusalem.

3. The Syriac Version (S) is extant in only one MS, written in 1169 and now in the Cambridge University Library. The text was published in full by R. H. Kennett (who took up the material of the late Prof. Bensley) in *The Epistles of St. Clement to the Corinthians in Syriac*, London, 1899. The MS contains the Harclean recension of the Philoxenian version of the New Testament, without the asterisks, obeli, and marginal readings. The order of the books is as follows: The Four Gospels, the Acts and Catholic Epistles, the Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, and the Epistles of Paul with the Hebrews standing last. The position of the Epistles of Clement is very significant, because, so far as the scribe is concerned, they are put on an absolute equality with the canonical writings. The date of this version is

uncertain. Lake thinks that it may perhaps best be placed in the eighth century.

4. The Latin Version (L) was unknown when Lightfoot published the second edition of his great work on Clement of Rome, 1890. Four years later, in the year 1894, the text of the Latin Version was published by Dom Morin in *Anecdota Maredsolna vol. 2* as S. *Clementis Romani ad Corinthios versio latina antiquissima*. The MS was probably written, according to Lake, in the eleventh century, but the version which it represents is extremely ancient. The MS is now in the Seminary at Namur.

5. The Coptic Version (K) is extant in two MSS in the Akhmimic dialect. Neither of them however is complete. The older and better preserved MS is in Berlin, and designated Kb by Lake. This is a beautiful papyrus of the fourth century from the famous "White monastery" of Shenute. The text was first published by C. Schmidt in 1908 in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xxxii.1 as *Der erste Clemensbrief in altkoptischer Uebersetzung*. The later and more incomplete MS is preserved in Strassburg (Ks). The text was published in 1910 by F. Rösch as *Bruchstücke des 1. Clemensbriefs*. The date of this MS is not certain, but it was probably written in the seventh century.

As Lake states in the introduction to his text, none of these five authorities can be regarded as undoubtedly

superior to the others, so that any critical text is necessarily eclectic. The number of variant readings among them is relatively small and for the most part unimportant. There seems to be a closer relationship between L and K, as far as we can judge from Lake's collation. They agree seven times: V.7 ἐπορεύθη, VI.1 πολλὰς αἰκίας καὶ βασάνους, VII.4 τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, XII.1 ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη πόρνη, XV.5 τὰ δόλια, XXII.7 both omit πολλαὶ αἱ θλίψεις τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ ἐκ πασῶν αὐτῶν ῥύσεται αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος, XXX.3 μή, while they disagree only three times: X.7 (L) πρὸς τὸ ὄρος ὅ (K) ἐν τῶν ὀρέων, XX.5 (L) "qui situ" (K) "boundaries", XXX.1 (L) ἁγία σῦν μερίς (K) ἁγίων σῦν μέρις.

6. Their characteristics. The most important authorities are A, C, and S, and they will prove to be valuable in our discussion of the individual quotations, which comprises the major section of this dissertation. Therefore their outstanding characteristics given by Lightfoot will now be considered briefly.

On the whole A appears to give a good text. There are many errors, of course, but they are largely due to the carelessness and ignorance of the scribe, and not to his intention. Thus there are errors of repetition or omission, the substitution of wrong case endings, owing mostly to confusion with the context, and transpositions of words.

Also we find the occasional dropping of words due to homoeoteleuton or other causes. These mistakes are of such nature that they can be easily corrected.

Fewer clerical errors are found in C, and in this respect it contrasts favorably with A. Its particular value rests on the fact that it is independent of A, for it preserves the correct reading in some cases where A is apparently wrong. The text which they have in common, in the opinion of Lightfoot, must be traced back to an archetype older than the fifth century, to which A itself belongs. In spite of all this, the text of C, when compared with that of A, is less trustworthy, because it shows manifest traces of critical revision.

This reveals itself most clearly in a harmonistic tendency in quotations. Since it has direct bearing upon our study, it may be dealt with in detail here. The examples of harmonistic readings are abundant. For instance, C reads in IV.1 τῷ κυρίῳ for τῷ θεῷ in accordance with the LXX. In IV.10 it has ἄρκοντα καὶ δικαστὴν for κριτὴν ἢ δικαστὴν also in accordance with the LXX. In XIII.4 it gives τοὺς λόγους for τὰ λόγια following the LXX. In XXXIII.1 it substitutes τί οὖν ἐραῦμεν for τὶ οὖν ποιήσωμεν in conformity with Romans VI.1. In XXXIV.6 Clement quotes loosely from Is VI.3 πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, but C substitutes πᾶσα ἡ γῆ in harmony with the LXX and Hebrew. In XXXIV.8 C inserts ἃ before ὀφθαλμὸς and substitutes ταῖς ἀγαπῶσιν for ταῖς

ὑπομένουσιν in order to bring the quotation closer to the passage in I Cor II.9. In XXXVI.2 it gives κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα transposing ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν of A, in conformity with Hebrews I.4. In XLVII.3 for αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ, C substitutes ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλὼ καὶ Κηφᾶ, which is the order in I Cor I.12. Now one cannot say that A is totally free from such harmonistic changes, but they are far less frequent in A than in C.

C's critical revision is also traceable in other changes obviously made from dogmatic motives. In XXX.8 C omits the words ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ from ταῖς κατηραμέναις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. This omission may be due to his dislike of ascribing a curse to God, although it is quite conceivable that these words may have been accidentally omitted since they occur just below in the parallel clause ταῖς ηὐλογημέναις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. In XII.1 C changes Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη into Ῥαὰβ ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη perhaps for the intention of honoring her who played an important role in the history of Israel. However this reading is supported by SLK. Also in XIV.2 C substitutes αἵρεσις for ἔριν due perhaps to make definite the object of Clement's condemnation.

C's deliberate changes are also revealed in its grammatical and rhetorical alterations. It tries wherever possible to improve the grammar, and to smooth out the style.

Another characteristic shortcoming of this MS is the abridgement of long quotations, giving only the beginning or the beginning and end, and sometimes mutilating it in other ways (see XVIII, XXII, XXVII, XXXV, and LII).

S is a conscientious and faithful reproduction of the Greek. The translator has taken pains not to miss a word of the original, so that the insignificant connecting particle τε is faithfully represented by ܟܝܬ . But no version is perfect; accordingly S is handicapped by the limitation of the Syriac language, and shows some shortcomings of its own. The Greek text, from which the Syriac Version was made, most frequently coincides with A, where A differs from C. Occasionally, however, C and S are arrayed together against A, in which cases A's readings are usually preferable. That S is an independent authority for the text of Clement is proved by the fact that in several readings it stands alone against AC. Concerning the complicated character of this version, Lightfoot states that "in itself S is both better and worse than C. It is made up of two elements, one very ancient and good, the other debased and probably recent; whereas C preserves a fairly uniform standard throughout."[43]

D. QUOTATIONS IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS

Besides these MSS and Versions valuable evidence is given by numerous quotations in the early Christian writers. They not only bear witness to the genuineness and integrity of the Epistle, but also supply important material for the determination of the text. Only outstanding ones will be listed below.[44]

1. Barnabas. The likenesses between Barnabas and Clement are not impressive.

Barnabas I.3	Cl XLVI.6
βλέπω ἐν ὑμῖν ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ	ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος
ταῦ πλουσίου τῆς ἀγάπης	τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.
Κυρίου πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.	

We must remember that "the outpouring" of the Holy Spirit is a common expression among the early Christian writers.

Barnabas XVII.2	Cl XLV.1
ἐλπίζει μου ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ	ζηλωταὶ περὶ τῶν ἀνη-
τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ μου μὴ παραλέλοι-	κόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν.
πέναι τι τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς	
σωτηρίαν.	

Although the words of Barnabas resemble those of Clement, the expression might have occurred to both writers independently.

1. Ignatius. The following are the parallels between Ignatius and Clement:

Polyc. V.	Cl XXXVIII.2
εἲ τις δύναται ἐν ἀγνείᾳ μένειν κ.τ.λ.	ὁ ἁγνὸς ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ [ἧτω καὶ] μὴ ἀλαζονευέσθω.
Ephes. XV.	Cl XXI.7
ἵνα . . . . δι' ὧν σιγᾷ γινώσκηται.	τὸ ἐπιεικὲς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς σιγῆς φανερὸν ποιησάτωσαν.
Ephes. XV.	Cl XXVII.3-6
οὐδὲν λανθάνει τὸν Κύριον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἡμῶν ἐγγὺς αὐτῷ ἐστίν.	πάντα ἐγγὺς αὐτῷ ἐστιν . . . . καὶ οὐδὲν λέληθεν τὴν βουλὴν αὐταῦ.

3. Polycarp. The resemblances of Poylycarp to Clement are more numerous and distinct than any preceding writers. It is probable that he had Clement in his hand.

4. Hermas. The first writer who ever mentions Clement's name is Hermas. *Vis.* II.4.3 reads Γράψεις οὖν δύο βιβλαρίδια καὶ πέμψεις ἓν Κλήμεντι καὶ ἓν Γραπτῇ. πέμψει οὖν Κλήμης εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται· Γραπτὴ δὲ νουθετήσει τὰς χήρας καὶ τοὺς ὀρφανούς. σὺ δὲ ἀναγνώσῃ εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν πραϊσταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Furthermore, there are many faint echoes of Clement's language in his writing.

5. The so-called Second Epistle of Clement. There are sufficient evidences for the supposition that the writer of II Clement was acquainted with and borrowed from the genuine Clement. The following parallel, for example, is

striking:

II Cl III.5	Cl XV.2
Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ταῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.	Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς ταῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

This passage in Clement XV.2 is from Is XXIX.13, which is also quoted in Mt XV.8 and Mk VII.6. Clement follows the evangelists rather than the LXX, the only exception being ἄπεστιν for ἀπέχει which the evangelists have with the LXX. II Clement slavishly copies the genuine Clement, changing the position of οὗτος only.

6. Justin Martyr. In *Dial.* 56 Justin uses the same expression in speaking of Moses as Clement XLIII.1, ὁ μακάριος [καὶ] πιστὸς θεράπων, and in *Dial.* 111, as in Clement XII.7, he uses Rahab's scarlet thread as a symbol of the blood of Christ. These similarities suggest that Justin was familiar with Clement's Epistle.

7. Letter of the Smyrnaeans. This letter shows its resemblance with Clement, especially at the beginning and at the end.

Letter of Smyr.	Cl
Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Σμύρναν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ ἐν Φιλομηλίῳ . . . . ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη [ἀπὸ] θεοῦ	Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον . . . . χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκρατορος

πατρὸς καὶ [τοῦ] Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη.	θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη.
ᾧ ἡ δόξα, τιμή, μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος, ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν. ἀμήν.	αὐτῷ δόξα, τιμή, κράτος καὶ μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος, ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

8. Clement of Alxandria. The greatest of all evidences for the text of Clement is given by numerous quotations in the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria.

(1) *Strom.* i.7.38

> Πολλῶν τοίνυν ἀνεῳγμένων πυλῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, αὕτη ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες αἱ εἰσελθόντες καὶ κατευθύνοντες τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι γνωστικῇ. αὐτίκα ὁ Κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ κατὰ λέξιν φησὶ τὰς διαφορὰς ἐκτιθέμενος τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν δοκίμων· ἤτω τις πιστός, ἤτω δυνατός τις γνῶσιν ἐξειπεῖν, ἤτω σοφὸς ἐν διακρίσει λόγων, ἤτω γοργὸς ἐν ἔργαις.

Although Lightfoot says, "he has correctly ascribed them to Clement," as a matter of fact he has not. Clement of Alexandria quotes the second passage from Cl XLVIII.5 with a formula citandi, but the first without it (Cl XLVIII.4).

(2) *Strom.* iv.6.32,33

> Εἶδον γαρ, φησί, τὸν ἀσεβῆ ὑπερυψούμενον κ.τ.λ. . . . . οὐκ ἐπαιρομένων ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ.

Clement of Alexandria does not attribute these passages to Clement, but it is clear that he is quoting them from his namesake, Cl XIV.5-XVI.1.

(3) *Strom.* iv.17-19.105-121

Ναὶ μὴν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ ὁ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν τύπον τινὰ ταῦ γνωστικαῦ ὑπογράφων λέγει· Τις γὰρ παρεπιδημήσας πρὸς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. (Cl I.2)

iv.17.112 ὅτι ὃ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ γέγραπται, διὰ Ἰησαῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐυκοτισμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ φῶς (Cl XXXVI.2); iv.18.113 ἡ σεμνὴ οὖν τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἡμῶν καὶ ἁγνὴ ἀγωγὴ κατὰ τὸν Κλήμεντα τὸ κοινωφελὲς ζητεῖ (Cl XLVIII. 1,6).

(4) *Strom.* v.12.81

ʼαλλὰ κάν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους Ῥωμαίων ἐπιστολῇ ὠκεανὸς ἀπέραντος ἀνθρώποις γέγραπται καὶ οἱ μετʼ αὐτὸν κόσμοι (Cl XX.8).

(5) *Strom.* vi.8.64

ʼΕξηγούμενος δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν ταῦ προφήτου Βαρνάβας ἐπιφέρει· πολλῶν πυλῶν ἀνεωγυιῶν ἡ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες οἱ εἰσελθόντες Cl XLVIII.4).

Clement of Alexandria wrongly attributes the words to Barnabas. This quotation from Cl LXVIII.4 is continued a little lower down, in vi.8,65 ἔστω τοίνυν πιστὸς ὁ τοιαῦτος, ἔστω δύνατος γνῶσιν ἐξειπεῖν, ἤτω σοφὸς ἐν διακρίσει λόγων, ἤτω γοργὸς ἐν ἔργοις, ἤτω ἁγνός. τοσούτω γὰρ μᾶλλον ταπεινοφρονεῖν ὀφείλει, ὅσῳ δοκεῖ μᾶλλον μείζων εἶναι, ὁ Κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους φησι (Cl XLVIII.6).

9. Origen.

(1) *de Princip.* ii.3.6

Meminit sane Clemens apostolorum discipulus etiam eorum quos ἀντίχθονας Graeci nominarunt, atque alias partes orbis terrae ad quas neque nostrorum quisquam accedere potest neque ex illis qui ibi sunt quisquam transire ad nos; quos et ipsos mundos appellavit, cum ait, Oceanus intransmeabilis est hominibus, et hi qui trans ipsum sunt mundi, qui his eisdem dominatoris Dei dispositionibus gubernantur (Cl XX.8).

(2) *Select. in Ezech.* viii.3

Φησὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Κλήμης, ὠκεανὸς ἀπέρατος ἀνθρώποις καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτὴν κόσμοι τοσαύταις διαταγαῖς ταῦ δεσπότου διοικαῦνται (Ibid.).

10. Dionysius of Alexandria. In *Epist. ad Hierac.* (Eusebius, *H.E.* vii.21) we find these words: ὁ πολὺς καὶ ἀπέραντος ἀνθρώποις ὠκεανός. Evidently this expression is borrowed from Cl XX.8, but at the same time dionysiua may have got it from above quotation of Origen.

11. Basil of Caesarea. Basil quotes from Clement LVIII, in *De Spirit. Sanct.* 29, the following words: ζῆ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ζῆ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησαῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. He, however, omits γάρ and the second ζῆ in his quotation.

12. Didymus of Alexandria. In *Expos. in Psalm.* cxxxviii he quotes from Cl XX.8 Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὠκεανὸς ἀπέραντος, ἀλλ' οὖν καί αἱ μετ' αὐτὸν κόσμοι ταὶς ταῦ δεσπότου διαταγαῖς διιθύνονται· πάντα γὰρ τὰ πρὸς αὐταῦ γεγενημένα ὅποι ποτ' ἐστὶν ταγαῖς τῆς ἑαυταῦ προναίας διαικούμενα

ἰθύνεται.

13. Leontius and Joannes. They quote in *Sacrarum Rerum Lib.* ii, from Cl XXXIII. This quotation has a direct bearing on our study, therefore it will be quoted here in its entirety.

> Ταῦ ἁγίου Κλήμεντος ῾Ρώμης ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῆς. αὐτος γὰρ ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων ἐπὶ ταῖς ἔργοις αὐταῦ ἀγάλλεται. τῷ γὰρ παμμεγεστάτῳ(sic) αὐταῦ κράτει οὐρανοὺς ἐστήριξεν καὶ τῇ ἀκαταλήπτῳ αὐτοῦ συνέσει διεκόσμησεν αὐτούς· γῆν δὲ διεχώρισεν ἀπὸ ταῦ περιέχοντος αυτὴν ὕδατος καὶ ἕδρασεν (sic) ἐπὶ τὸν ἀσφαλῆ ταῦ ἰδίου θελήματος θεμέλιον· ἐπὶ τούταις τὸν ἐξοτατον(sic) καὶ παμμεγέθη ἄνθρωπον ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐταῦ καὶ ἀμώμαις χερσὶν ἔπλασεν τῆς ἑαυταῦ εἰκόνος χαρακτῆρα· οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ θεός· Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ᾽ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ᾽ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν· καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς· ταῦτα οὖν πάντα τελειώσας ἐπαίνεσεν(sic) αὐτὰ καὶ αὐλόγησεν καὶ αἶπεν Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε (Cl XXXIII.2-6).
>
> τοῦ αὐταῦ ἐκ τῆς θ̄ ἐπιστολῆς. ἵνα καὶ γενώμεθα βουληθέντος αὐταῦ, οὐκ ὄντες πρὶν γενέσθαι, καὶ γενόμενοι ἀπολαύσωμεν τῶν δι᾽ ἡμας γενομένων. διὰ ταῦτό ἐσμεν ἄνθρωποι καὶ φρόνησιν ἔχομεν καὶ λόγον, παρ᾽ αὐταῦ λαβόντες.

14. Maximus the Confessor. There is a reference to Clement in *Prolog. in Op. S. Dionys*, and a quotation of Cl XLVIII.6, in *Sermo* 49 Κλήμεντος. τοσοῦτόν τις μᾶλλον ὀφείλει καταφρονεῖν, ὅσον δοκεῖ μᾶλλον εἶναι.

15. John of Damascus. Cl XXXIII is quoted by him in *Parallela Vaticana*, a. viii.

Αὐτὸς ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἅπαντων ἐπὶ ταῖς ἔργοις αὐταῦ ἀγάλλεται. τῷ γὰρ παμμεγεστάτῳ αὐταῦ κράτει οὐρανοὺς ἐστήριξεν, καὶ τῇ ἀκαταλήπτῳ αὐταῦ συνέσει διεκόσμησεν αὐτούς· γῆν δὲ ἐχώρισεν ἀπὸ ταῦ περιέχοντος αὐτὴν ὕδατος, καὶ ἥδρασεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀσφαλῆ ταῦ ἰδίου θελήματος θεμέλιον· ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸν ἐξοχώτατον καὶ παμμεγέθη ἄνθρωπον ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐταῦ καὶ ἀμώμοις χερσὶν ἔπλασεν τῆς ἑαυταῦ εἰκόνος χαρακτῆρα. οὕτως γὰρ φησιν ὁ θεός. Παιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. καὶ ἐπαίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐπαίησεν αὐτούς. ταῦτα οὖν πάντα τελειώσας, ἐπαίησεν αὐτὰ καὶ ηὐλόγησε καὶ εἶπεν, Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε.(Cl XXXIII.2-6)

16. Georgius Hamartolus. *Chron.* i.9

Περὶ οὗ [ταῦ 'Αβρὰμ] μέντοι καὶ Κλήμης ὁ 'Ρωμαῖος καὶ σοφώτατος καὶ μαθητὴς Πέτρου ταῦ μεγάλου γνήσιος οὕτως ἔφη· λιμαῦ δὲ γενομένου καταλιπὼν 'Αβρὰμ τὴν χαναναίαν γῆν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπῄει κ.τ.λ.

Lightfoot states that although an account of Abraham's conflict with Abimelech follows here, it is not found in Clement.

17. Antonius Melissa. He quotes from Cl XLVIII.6 in *Loci Communes* ii. 73: Τοσαῦτόν τις μᾶλλον ὀφείλει ταπεινοφρονεῖν, ὅσον δοκεῖ μᾶλλον εἶναι.

There are many other references but they are of little importance for our purpose. All the references and quotations found in the writings beyond the tenth century are not enumerated in this list. These references and quotations in the early Christian writers bear witness to the genuineness and integrity of the Epistle.

NOTES ON I. PROLEGOMENA

1. C. H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*; Franklin Johnson, *The quotations of the New Testament from the Old.*

2. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 133.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 143.

4. Cf. J. R. Harris, *Testimonies.*

5. H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 410 f.

6. Swete (*op. cit.* p. 407) gives a list of the exact or nearly exact quotations of the LXX in Clement of Rome. There are some mistakes in this list.

7. Wendland, *Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen*, p. 378.

8. Stählin and Schmid, *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur*, p. 973, "So vertritt der Brief eine eigenartige litterarische Mischform; er ist ein wirklichen Brief, hat aber doch von Anfang an litterarischen Charakter."

9. See Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, I. 346 ff. This chapter is more or less based on his discussion.

10. These names are given in Uhlhorn's article in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd edition.

11. *Ibid.*

12. Knopf, *Der Erste Clemensbrief*, p. 42.

13. Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, I, 30.

14. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur*, I, 120.

15. Chapman, Article on "Clement I," *The Catholic Encyclopedia.*

16. Marsh, Article on "Epistle of Clement of Rome," in *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, Vol. I.

17. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur*, p. 251.

18. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 258.

19. For these names, see Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 346 f.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 346 f.

21. Merrill, *Essays in Early Christian History*, p. 223.

22. Acts, Ch. 18.

23. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, II, 144.

24. Moffatt, *Hebrews*, ICC, p. xv.

25. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 258.

26. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, p. 191.

27. Their differences are not very important. Goodspeed, *Introduction*, p. 257-8, (before or about A.D. 95); Lake, *Introduction*, p. 159, (must have been written before the memory of the Temple, which was destroyed in A.D. 70, had died out; but it seems equally or even more likely that they are only based on a knowledge of the Septuagint); Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 451, (c. A.D. 80, or more generally the Domitianic period); McNeile, *Introduction*, p. 224, (c. 81-5); Scott, *Literature of N.T.*, p. 199, (Between 80-90 A.D.); McCown, *Promise*, p. 237, (90-100 A.D.); Moffatt, *ICC*, p. xxii, (cannot be later than about A.D. 85); Windish, *Der Hebräerbrief*, p. 115, (81-96); Dibelius, *Fresh Approach*, p. 197, (should be assigned to the period A.D. 70-95); Jülicher-Fascher, *Einleitung*, p. 153, (75-85).

28. Lightfoot, *op. cit.* I, 346 ff.

29. *Op. cit.*, p. 189 f.

30. See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, I, 346 ff.

31. So Cowley, *Judith*, in Charles' *ASOT*, p. 144 f., and Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, p. 382 f, and *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*, p. 177 f.

32. Knopf, *Der Erste Clemensbrief*, p. 43.

33. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I, 3.

34. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, I, 346 ff.

35. *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

36. *Op. cit.*, II, 637. Cf. also Cayré, *Manual of Patrology and History of Theology*, p. 53.

37. Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, iv.22.

38. See below.

39. Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers*, p. 128 ff.

40. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, I, 363.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 346 ff.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 346 ff.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 143 f.

44. For this chapter I am indebted to Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, I, 148-200, and to Gebhardt and Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, pp. xxiv-xliv. See also Harnack, *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand der Altchristlichen Literatur*, p. 39 ff.

II. OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN CLEMENT

A. TABLE OF OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES QUOTED IN CLEMENT

The Epistle of Clement abounds in quotations from the Old Testament. They consist of nearly a quarter of the entire Epistle. In dealing with them one faces the difficulth of distinguishing direct citations from mere allusions and reminiscences. In general Swete's definition of formal citations is useful. By "passages formally cited" he means (1) those which are cited with an introductory formula, such as λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή or καθὼς γέγραπται; (2) those which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the Old Testament.[1] The following is a fairly complete list of direct quotations:[2]

Gen	I. 9	Cl XX. 6
	I. 26,27	XXXIII. 5
	I. 28	XXXIII. 6
	II. 23	VI. 3
	IV. 3-8	IV. 1
	XII. 1-3	X. 3
	XIII. 14-16	X. 4,5
	XV. 5	XXXII. 2
	XV. 5,6	X. 6
	XVIII, 27	XVII. 2
	XXII. 17	XXXII. 2
	XXVI. 4	XXXII. 2
	L. 20	LX. 3
Ex	II. 14	IV. 10
	III. 11	XVII. 5

Ex	IV. 10	Cl XVII. 5
	VI. 1	LX. 3
	XIV. 23	LI. 5
	XIV. 26 (28)	LI. 5
	XV. 19	LI. 5
	XXXII. 7-10	LIII. 2,3
	XXXII. 31,32	LIII. 4
Num	VI. 25,26	LX. 3
	XII. 7	XVII. 5
	XII. 7	XLIII. 1
	XVI. 22	LXIV. 1
	XVI. 33	LI. 4
	XVII. 16	LXIV. 1
	XVIII. 17	XXIX. 3
Deut	IV. 34	XXIX. 3
	IV. 34	LX. 3
	V. 15	LX. 3
	IX. 12-14	LIII. 2,3
	XII. 25	LX. 2
	XII. 25 (28)	LXI. 2
	XII. 28	LX. 2
	XIII. 19	LX. 2
	XIV. 2	XXIX. 3
	XIV. 2	LXIV. 1
	XXI. 9	LX. 2
	XXX. 9	LX. 3
	XXXII. 8,9	XXIX. 2
	XXXII. 15	III. 1
	XXXII. 39	LIX. 3
I Sam	II. 6	LIX. 3
	II. 7	LIX. 3
	II. 10	XIII. 1
	XIII. 14b	XVIII. 1
I Kgs	VIII. 60	LIX. 4
	IX. 4	LX. 2

II Kgs	V. 7	Cl LIX. 3
	XIX. 19	LIX. 4
I Ch	XXIX. 15 (?)	XVII. 6
II Ch	XXX. 9	LX. 1
	XXXI. 14	XXIX. 3
Job	I. 1	XVII. 3
	IV. 16-18	XXXIX. 3-9
	IV. 19 - V. 5	XXXIX. 3-9
	V. 11	LIX. 3
	V. 17-26	LVI. 6-15
	XI. 2,3	XXX. 4,5
	XIV. 4,5	XVII. 4
	XV. 15	XXXIX. 3-9
	XIX. 26	XXVI. 3
	XXXVIII. 11	XX. 7
Ps	II. 7,8	XXXVI. 4
	III. 6	XXVI. 2
	XI. 4-6	XV. 5-7
	XVII. 26,27	XLVI. 3
	XVIII. 2-4	XXVII. 7
	XXI. 7-9	XVI. 15,16
	XXII. 4	XXVI. 2
	XXIII. 1	LIV. 3
	XXVII. 7	XXVI. 2
	XXX. 19	XV. 5
	XXXI. 1,2	L. 6
	XXXI. 10	XXII. 1-8
	XXXII. 10	LIX. 3
	XXXIII. 12-18	XXII. 1-8
	XXXIII. 20	XXII. 1-8
	XXXVI. 9	XIV. 4
	XXXVI. 35-37	XIV. 5
	XXXVI. 38	XIV. 4
	XXXIX. 3	LX. 2
	XLVIII. 15	LI. 4

Ps	XLIX. 14,15	Cl	LII. 5
	XLIX. 16-23		XXXV. 7
	L. 3-19		XVIII. 2-17
	L. 19		LII. 3
	LXI. 5		XV. 3
	LXVI. 2		LX. 3
	LXVIII. 31-33		LII. 2
	LXX. 21c-22a		XXVI. 2
	LXXVII. 36,37		XV. 4
	LXXVIII. 13		LIX. 4
	LXXIX. 4(8,20)		LX. 3
	LXXXVIII. 21		XVIII. 1
	XCIV. 7		LIX. 4
	XCIX. 3		LIX. 4
	CIII. 4		XXXVI. 3
	CIX. 1		XXXVI. 5
	CXVII. 18		LVI. 3,4
	CXVII. 19,20		XLVIII. 2
	CXVIII. 114		LIX. 4
	CXVIII. 133		LX. 2
	CXXXVIII. 7-10		XXVIII. 3
	CXL. 5		LVII. 5
	CXLIV. 18		LX. 4
Prov	I. 23-33		LVIII. 3-7
	II. 21,22		XIV. 4
	III. 12		LVI. 3,4
	III. 34		XXX. 2
	VII. 3		II. 8
	XX. 27		XXI. 2
	XXIV. 12		XXXIV. 3
Wis	II. 24		III. 4
	XII. 12		XXVII. 5
Sir	II. 11		LX. 1
Amos	IX. 4		LX. 3
Joel	II. 13		LX. 1

Mal	III. 1	Cl	XXIII. 5
Is	I. 16-20		VIII. 4
	III. 5		III. 3
	VI. 3		XXXIV. 6
	X. 33		LIX. 3
	XIII. 11		LIX. 3
	XIII. 22		XXIII. 5
	XXVI. 20		L. 4
	XXIX. 13		XV. 2
	XL. 10		XXXIV. 3
	LIII. 1-12		XVI. 3-14
	LVII. 15		LIX. 3
	LIX. 14		III. 4
	LX. 17		XLII. 5
	LXII. 11		XXXIV. 3
	LXIV. 3		XXXIV. 8
	LXVI. 2		XIII. 4
Jer	IX. 22, 23		XIII. 1
	XXI. 10		LX. 3
	XXIV. 6		LX. 3
	XXXIX. 21		LX. 3
Ez	XVII. 24		LIX. 3
	XVIII. 30 f.		VIII. 3
	XX. 33, 34		LX. 3
	XXI. 31		LIX. 3
	XXXIII. 11		VIII. 2
	XXXVI. 28		LIX. 4
	XXXVII. 12		L. 4
	XLVIII. 12		XXIX. 3
Dan	VII. 10 (θ)		XXXIV. 6

The Old Testament books, which are not quoted in Clement are Lev, Jos, Jud, Ruth, II Sam, I Esd, II Esd (Ez=Neh), Tobit, Judith, Esther, Od, Eccl, Cant, Ps Sal,

Hos, Mic, Oba, Jon, Nah, Hab, Zep, Hag, Zech, Bar, Threni, Ep Jer, Susanna, Bel, I -IV Mac.

As the above list clearly indecates, Clement does not employ the books of the Old Testament uniformly. The most favored is the Psalms, and nearly one-half of his quotations are taken from this book. This is not surprising, for the Psalms were in use for liturgical purposes from the very beginning of the Church, and were the most familiar and highly esteemed book of the early Christians.

Swete gives a list of the exact or nearly exact quotations of the LXX in Clement in his *Introduction*, but this list is inadequate and full of typographical errors.[3]

Errors	Corrections
Cl IV.9 (Ex II.14)	Cl IV.10 (Ex II.14)
X.6 (Gen XV.5)	X.6 (Gen XV.5,6)
XIII.1 (Jer IX.23 f.)	XIII.1 (Jer IX.22,23)
XIII.3 (Is XLVI.2)	XIII.4 (Is XLVI.2)
XV.4 (Ps LXXVII.36)	XV.4 (Ps LXXVII.36,37)
XV.5 (Ps XI.5)	XV.5,6 (Ps XI.4-6)
XXI.2 (Prov XX.21)	XXI.2 (Prov XX.27)
XXVI.2 (Job XIX.26)	XXVI.3 (Job XIX.26)
XXVII.3 (Wis XII.12+XI.22)	XXVII.5 (Wis XII.12)
XXX.4 (Job XI.2,3)	XXX.4,5 (Job XI.2,3)
XLVI.2 (Ps XII.26 f.)	XLVI.3 (Ps XII.26 f.)

Besides these typographical errors, there are many shortcomings of diverse kinds. For instance, he includes in this list partly exact and partly free quotations (Cl VIII.2 = Ez XXXIII.11; Cl XIII.1 = Jer IX.22-23), free

quotations (Xl XVIII.1 = Ps LXXXVIII.21; Cl XXI.2 = Prov XX.27; Cl XXIII.5 = Is XIII.22 + Mal III.1; Cl XVIII.3 = Ps CXXXVIII.7-10; Cl XLII.5 = Is LX.17), and a very free quotations (Xl XXVI.3 = Job XIX.26). On the other hand, he misses the following exact or nearly exact quotations, which should be included in the list: Cl III.4 = Wis II.24; Cl XX.6 = Gen I.9; Cl XXXIII.5 = Gen I.26,27; Cl XXXIII.6 = Gen I.28; Cl Li.5 = Ex XIV.23, etc.; Cl LII.3 = Ps XLIX.14,15 + Ps L.19; and Cl LIII.2,3 = Deut IX.12-14.

B. FORMULAS OF CITATION

Of the ninety-three quotations, fifty-three are introduced by a formula of citation. By the formula of citation we mean the introductory words which either distinctly announce or imply a quotation from the Old Testament. It takes various forms in Clement.

(1) ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον (III.1)
(2) γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως (IV.1; XXXVI.3)
(3) ἐλάλησεν μετὰ ὅρκου (VIII.2)
(4) ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει οὕτως (VIII.4)
(5) λέγει γὰρ αὐτῷ (X.3)
(6) εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός (X.4)
(7) πάλιν λέγει (X.6; XIV.5; XV.4; LVI.6-15)
(8) ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον., λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ
    ἅγιον (XIII.1)
(9) φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος (XIII.4)
(10) γέγραπται γάρ (XIV.4; XXXIX.3-9; L.4; L.6)
(11) λέγει γάρ που (XV.2; XXI.2; XXVI.2)
(12) καὶ πάλιν (XV.3; XV.5,6)

(13) φησὶν γάρ (XVI.3-14)
(14) καὶ πάλιν αὐτός φησιν (XVI.15,16)
(15) περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτως γέγραπται (XVII.3)
(16) εἶπεν ὁ θεός (XVIII.1)
(17) καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει πρὸς τὸν θεόν (XVIII.2-17)
(18) εἶπεν γάρ (XX.7)
(19) οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς (XXII.1-8)
(20) συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς (XXIII.5)
(21) πάλιν Ἰὼβ λέγει (XXVI.3)
(22) λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖον (XXVIII.3)
(23) οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται (XXIX.2)
(24) ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει (XXIX.3)
(25) φησίν (XXX.2; LVI.5)
(26) ὡς ἐπαγγειλαμένου ταῦ θεαῦ (XXXII.2)
(27) λέγει γάρ (XXX.4,5; XXXIV.8)
(28) οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ θεός (XXXIII.5)
(29) καὶ εἶπεν (XXXIII.6)
(30) προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν (XXXIV.3)
(31) λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (XXXIV.6; XXXV.7)
(32) οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης (XXXVI.4)
(33) πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν (XXXVI.5)
(34) οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή (XLVI.3)
(35) πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει (XLVI.3)
(36) καθὼς γέγραπται (XLVIII.2)
(37) φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δαυείδ (LII.2)
(38) καὶ πάλιν λέγει (LII.3)
(39) εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ θεός (LIII.2,3)
(40) καὶ εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς (LIII.4)
(41) οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος (LVI.3,4)
(42) οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία (LVII.3-7)

Some of these formulas of citation are significant, and throw light upon Clement's conception of the Old Testament. The words συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς (XXIII.5) reveal that the Old Testament was commonly called ἡ γραφή

in the time of Clement, and the formula λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖον (XXVIII.3) leads one to the natural inference that Clement must have adopted the threefold division of the Old Testament books which appears in the Prologue of Sirach. There the third division is called τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων, but the more general name in Hebrew was כתובים, "the writings," translated sometimes γραφεῖα, sometimes ἁγιόγραφα. In these introductory words Clement calls the Psalms τὸ γραφεῖον. The Book of Proverbs is called ἡ πανάρετος σοφία by him. "'The excellent wisdom' is a title used (a) of Proverbs, (b) of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and Ecclesiastes, (c) of the third division of the O.T.(Hagiographa or "writings") as a whole."[4] In the formula οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία refers to Proverbs. This book is quoted as such by other early Christian writers. Sometimes it bears the name σοφία simply.[5] "Whether the epithet πανάρετος was first used by Clement and derived from him by later writers, or not, it is impossible to say."[6]

C. OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN CLEMENT

Our task in this chapter is to compare very carefully the texts of Clement, the LXX and the Hebrew, and thereby to determine, if possible, whether Clement has quoted from the LXX as it is generally accepted, and if so, what MS or MSS in general he supports. At the same time the method

and manner of his quotation will be studied. For this purpose I have used the text of Professor Kirsopp Lake, in the Loeb Classical Library, the LXX text of Alfred Rahlfs, and the Hebrew text of Rudolf Kittel.

The critical apparatus for the text of Clement is given by GH, Li and La. But before the publication of GH only two MSS were known. Consequently the critical apparatus of GH is confined to the collation of A and C. Later the Syriac Version was discovered, and it was collated by Li in his revised edition. So far as these three authorities are concerned, Li's critical apparatus is satisfactory, but after his monumental work was published, the Latin Version and the Coptic Versions were added to the witness for the text of Clement. La makes use of these later additions in his text, but his critical apparatus is unfortunately brief and incomplete. I have referred to these editors freely in my discussions, but in order to avoid unnecessary complexity I do not give references save in a few exceptional cases. They will be found in these works and in their respective places.

A critical apparatus is given in Rahlfs' edition of the LXX, but it is limited to a few important MSS, such as SAB. In the Larger Cambridge Edition of the LXX, whose critical apparatus is more thorough than any other previously

published, so far only the historical portion of the Old Testament has been published. I have consulted this Larger Edition, incomplete as it now is, along with Rahlfs. As to the Hebrew text, I have depended upon the critical apparatus of Kittel's edition.

In this dissertation I have laid chief stress upon the textual study of Clement's quotations of the Old Testament, and touched upon the literary side very lightly, and that only when it would seem to clarify the passage in question. Therefore the exegesis of the quotations and Clement's method of application are almost entirely neglected. Such a study will make a good sequence to this work.

D. SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The symbols of the LXX MSS (see Swete's *Introduction*, p. 124 ff. and BMT, prefatory notes of each volume)

The symbols of the MSS of Cl (see Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I, 7)

In connection with the signs of the MSS, the following symbols and abbreviations will be found:

[ ] in the texts indicates that the words in brackets do not belong to the quotation.

: is used to separate variants on the same word or phrase, the reading of the LXX always preceding that of Cl.

/ is used to separate variants on one word or phrase from those on another.

1°, 2°, & c. = the first, second, & c. time the word or phrase occurs in the verse.

( ) after a symbol contain a peculiarity of apelling or wording found only in that authority.

+ or add. = adds, add

- or om. = omits, omit

c. = with

cf. = compare

cit = citation

cod(d). = codex, codices

f., ff. = following, followings

ins. = inserts, insert

pau = a few MSS up to about a quarter of the known Miniscules.

pr. = premises

rec. = recension

rel. = remaining MSS

tr. = transposes; if more than two words are concerned, the inverted words are separated by /

v(v). = verse, verses

MT = Hebrew (Massoretic)text

Ar = Armenian

L = Latin

Lu = Lucianic recension

LXX = Septuagint

S = Syriac Version

Sam = Samaritan version

T° = Targum of Onkelos

Cl = Clement of Rome

ClAlex = Clement of Alexandria

Eus = Eusebius

Hil = Hilary

Justin = Justin Martyr

Phil = Philo

BMT = Brooke, M^c^Lean, and Thackeray

GH = Gebhardt and Harnack

GHZ = Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn (small edition)

Gr = Septuaginta Interpretes ed. Ioan. Ern. Grabe. I-IV. Oxonii 1707-20(mentioned in Rahlfs' critical apparatus)

He = Hefele

Ki = Kittel

Kn = Knopf

La = Lake

Li = Lightfoot

Ra = Rahlfs

Sw = Swete

E. DISCUSSION OF THE QUOTATIONS

Prov VII.3b	Cl II.8
ἐπίγραψον δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος	ἐπὶ τὰ πλάτη τῆς καρδίας

Prov VII.3b כתבם על־לוח לבך

ἐπίγραψον: ἐγέγραπτο Cl / δέ: - Cl / τὸ πλάτος Ra Sw, τὸ πλακός Gr cf. III.3, XXII.20: πλάτη Cl /

The LXX has no equivalent for "them" of כתבם, probably because it is already given in the first part of this verse. The word δέ is inserted after ἐπίγραψον. Vv. 1 and 2 have δέ(representing ו), therefore it may have been inserted here also. The LXX has τὸ πλάτος for לוח. But πλάξ (gen. πλακός) is the better rendering, and is used often in the LXX to translate the word לוח (cf. Ex XXXI.18, Deut VI.13,

---

ἐπίγραψον] The meaning of the two words is the same. The change of the form of the verb is necessary to suit Cl's context.

δέ] It is unnecessary for Cl's context. Cl's agreement with the MT in omitting δέ is merely accidental.

τὸ πλάτος] The word πλάτος does not occur elsewhere in the Apostolic Fathers, but the expression τὸ πλάτος τῆς καρδίας is not uncommon in the subsequent Christian fathers, e.g. Iren. i. *praef.* 3, and other passages. The plural form in Cl may be due to his context. Paul's metaphor in II Cor III.3 ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις is derived from the Hebrew of Prov VII.3.

σου] See above for the possible explanation of the plural form.

Besides these variants, Cl changes the word order of the

τῆς καρδίας σου.	ὑμῶν ἐγέγραπτο.
Deut XXXII.15	Cl III.1
καὶ ἔφαγεν Ιακωβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη,	ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν, καὶ
καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπαμένος,	ἐπλατύνθη καὶ ἐπαχύνθη, καὶ

Deut XXXII.15 וישמן ישרון ויבעט שמנת עבית כשית

σου: ὑμῶν Cl

Deut XXXII.15 καί: - Cl Ar / ἔφαγεν: + καὶ ἔπιεν Cl Eus Hil(BMT) / Ἰακωβ: - Cl, "Jeshurun" MT / καὶ

I Kgs VIII.9, etc.). It is possible that the LXX at first read πλακός, which was later changed to πλάτος by a confusion of the two words.

Deut XXXII.15 MT has "Jeshurun" for "Jacob." In MT, the person addressed is 2 p., while in the LXX, it is 3 p. MT has no corresponding word for "the beloved" of the LXX. On

---

LXX. Probably he is paraphrasing this OT passage, which was familiar to him and others, to show that God's command to Israel has been realized in the Christians at Corinth. Cl's quotation is not introduced by a formula citandi, but it is obviously based on the LXX of Prov VII.3b.

Deut XXXII.15 καί] Cl's context does not require καί.

ἔφαγεν] Whether Eus is quoting from Cl or from another LXX MS cannot be determined, since BMT does not give the exact reference. The word ἔπιεν (in plural) is found in the preceding verse of the LXX, e.g. XXXII.14e καὶ αἷμα σταφυλῆς ἔπιον οἶνον. As ἔφαγεν and ἔπιεν make a good combination, Cl may have supplied the word, changing the number of the verb to suit his context.

Ἰακωβ] In the LXX Ἰακώβ and ὁ ἠγαπημένος are parallels,

ἐλιπάνθη, ἐπαχύνθη, ἐπλατύνθη. ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπημένος.

Is III.5 Cl III.3

καὶ συμπεσεῖται ὁ λαός, ἄνθρωπος [οὕτως ἐπηγέρθησαν] αἱ

ἐνεπλήσθη: - Cl Eus(BMT) / ἐλιπάνθη: - Cl Eus(BMT)

Is III.5 προσκόψε: ἐπηγέρθησαν Cl / τὸ παιδίον:

---

the contrary Cl and the LXX agree in having ὁ ἠγαπημένος, although Ιακωβ is missing from Al, because the passage of Deut was applied by him to the Corinthians.

---

but Cl disregards this parallelism and has only ὁ ἠγαπημένος, which is represented in the MT by "thou."

καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη] As to the reading of Eus, BMT offers no reference. Cl probably omits ἐνεπλήσθη as other verbs take care of its meaning.

ἐλιπάνθη] As to Eus, see above. The omission of the word by Cl may be due to the fact that ἐλιπάνθη and ἐπαχύνθη have a similar meaning.

Although all the words in Cl are found in the LXX, the order is different. Justin (*Dial.*20) quotes from the same passage, but there is no special resemblance between his and Cl's quotation. Cl is probably quoting from memory in spite of a formula citandi, ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον.

Is III.5 προσκόψει] Cl's substitution of the verb can be explained only by a supposition that he is quoting from memory. The change in person and tense is due to his context. The MT has a plural, ירהבו.

τὸ παιδίον] Cl uses both words in the Epistle (παιδίον

πρὸς ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐταῦ· προσκόψει τὸ παιδίον πρὸς τὸν πρεσβύτην, ὁ ἄτιμος πρὸς τὸν ἔντιμον.	ἄτιμοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐντίμους, [οἱ ἄδοξοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους, οἱ ἄφρονες ἐπὶ τοὺς φρονίμους,] οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.

Is III.5 וננש העם איש באיש ואיש ברעהו ירהבו הנער בזקן והנקלה בנכבד

Is LIX.14	Cl III.4
[καὶ] ἡ δικαιοσύνη μακρὸν	πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἡ δικαιοσύνη.

οἱ νέοι Cl / Is LIX.14 μακράν: πόρρω

ירהבו(pl.): προσκόψει(sing.)

XVI.3 cit; νέος LII.2 cit, I.3, XXI.6), but the word νέος appears to be his favorite. He consistently employs the plural form in this passage, e.g. τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, οἱ ἄτιμοι, τοὺς ἐντίμους.

Both Li and La indicate these words as taken from the LXX of Is III.5. On the other hand, GH and Kn do not distinguish them in their texts as a quotation, but credit as an allusion. The quotation has no formula citandi.

Is LIX.14 μακράν] These words are the same in meaning, and Barnabas uses the two words together, probably for emphasis, in XX.2 ὧν μακρὰν καὶ πόρρω πραΰτης καὶ ὑπομονή. Cl never uses μακράν but πόρρω many times in the Epistle, e.g. XXIII.3, XXXIX.9, XV.2. In XXIII.3 and XXXI.9, the order of words is the same as here, that is πόρρω comes the first, then the verb, and the noun.

ἀφέστηκεν.   Is LIX.14 וצדקה מרחוק תעמד

Wis II.24 quoted in Cl III.4

θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

ἀφέστηκεν (+ ἀφ' ἡμῶν LXX-A Lu): ἄπεστιν Cl-A (ἀπέστη Cl-C)

תעמד: ἀφέστηκεν

ἀφέστηκεν] The combination πόρρω ἄπεστιν occurs also in Cl XV.2 cit, where the LXX reads πόρρω ἀπέχει. The expression may have been Cl's favorite one.

This quotation has no formula citandi. Evidently Cl is quoting from memory.

Wis II.24 This quotation is clearly taken from Wis II.24 verbatim. The same citation with the same application is found in the following passage of Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii.29 ὁ Σατανᾶς . . . . ἐφ' ᾧ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν θανατῶσαι αὐτοὺς φθόνῳ φερόμενος, ἡνίκα ἑώρα τὸν Ἄβελ εὐαρεστοῦντα τῷ θεῷ, ἐνεργήσας εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν καλούμενον Κάϊν ἐποίησεν ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἄβελ, καὶ οὕτως ἀρχὴ θανάτου ἐγένετο εἰς τόνδε τὸν κόσμον κ.τ.λ. Cf. Rom V.12 ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν, ... καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν. Cl's quotation has no formula citandi.

Gen IV.3-8 3 κυρίῳ] The harmonistic reading of Cl-C is unreliable here. Cl is consistent in reading θεός in this quotation. Cf. v.6.

Gen IV.3-8 quoted in Cl IV.1-6

3 καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ ἡμέρας ἤνεγκεν Κάϊν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ, 4 καὶ Ἄβελ ἤνεγκεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων αὐταῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεάτων αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς δώροις αὐταῦ,

[3]ויהי מקץ ימים ויבא קין מפרי האדמה מנחה ליהוה [4]והבל הביא גם־הוא
מבכרות צאנו ומחלבהן וישע יהוהאל־הבל ואל־מנחתו [5]ואל־קין

---

3 κυρίῳ: θεῷ Cl-AS(κυρίῳ Cl-C MT) / 4 τῶν προβάτων αὐταῦ c. MT: - αὐταῦ Cl-AC(+ αὐταῦ Cl-S c. LXX) / ἐπεῖδεν Ra c. Cl, ἔπιδεν Sw, ἐπίδεν BMT c. LXX-AM, ἔπιδε Cl-A /

3 The LXX renders מקץ ימים by μεθ' ἡμέρας, and omits καί before ἤνεγκεν. 4 יהוה is rendered ὁ θεός, and מנחתו ταῖς δώροις αὐταῦ. 5 מנחתו in this verse is also rendered by a plural noun (ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ). The LXX has προσέσχεν for שעה. ויפלו פניו (plu) is rendered καὶ συνέπεσεν τῷ προσ. (sing). So also in v.6. The LXX rendering of פניו by τῷ προσώπῳ (dative) is difficult to account for except as a very early transcriptional error in the LXX. The LXX omits αὐταῦ after προσώπῳ. 6 The LXX adds ὁ θεός after κύριος.

5 ἐλύπησεν τὸν Κάϊν] Cl has ἐλυπήθη. The MT reads ויחר לקין. The LXX translates ל by τόν, which changes the original meaning, "and Cain was angry." If the subject of ἐλύπησεν is God, the LXX misses the meaning of the Hebrew idiom, but if the subject is the act of God, then the LXX is not different from the MT. At any rate, ἐλυπήθη represents the original meaning better.

τῷ προσώπῳ] Cl adds αὐταῦ. The MT reading ויפלו פניו is represented in the LXX by συνέπεσεν τῷ προσώπῳ. The dative of τῷ προσώπῳ though intelligible is awkward and hard to account for. The same form of the Hebrew is also found

5 ἐπὶ δὲ Κάϊν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ οὐ προσέσχεν. καὶ ἐλύπησεν τὸν Κάϊν λίαν, καὶ συνέπεσεν τῷ προσώπῳ. 6 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Κάϊν Ἵνα τί περίλυπος ἐγένου, καὶ ἵνα τί συνέπεσεν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου; 7 οὐκ, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἥμαρτες; ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σέ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐταῦ, καὶ σὺ ἄρξεις αὐταῦ. 8 καὶ εἶπεν Κάϊν πρὸς
ואל־מנחתו לא שעה ויחר לקין מאד ויפלו פניו [6]ויאמר יהוה אל־קין
למה חרה לך ולמה נפלו פניך [7]חלוא אם־תיטיב שאת ואם לא

---

5 ἐλύπησεν τὸν Κάϊν: ἐλυπήθη Κάϊν Cl / τῷ προσώπῳ: + αὐταῦ Cl-A MT, τὸ πρόσωπον Kn GHZ c. Cl-CS / 6 κύριος ὁ θεός: - κύριος Cl / τῷ Κάϊν: πρὸς Κάϊν Cl / ἵνα τί: ἱνατί Cl twice / 7 ἐάν LXX-AME Cl-A: ἄν Cl-C / ἄρξεις αὐταῦ LXX-AME Cl-A: tr. Cl-C / 8 διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον

---

7 The MT has "If thou doest well, shall it not be lifted up? and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door; and unto thee shall be its desire; but do thou rule over it." The meaning here is not clear. The LXX rendering is also ambiguous, "if thou offeredst rightly, but did not divide rightly, didst thou not sin? Be still; he shall turn to thee, and thou shalt rule over him." 8 The LXX inserts the

---

in v.6, where ולמה נפלו פניך is translated adequately by ἵνα τί συνέπεσεν τὸ προσώπόν σου; Li suggests the τῷ προσώπῳ is a transcriber's error which must have taken place very early in the LXX. All the important MSS of the LXX support this reading. Cl apparently copied τῷ προσώπῳ as it was, although Cl-CS read τὸ πρόσωπον in accordance with that follows (v.6). Kn and GHZ choose the latter reading against GH, Li, and La.

6 τῷ Κάϊν] Cl reads πρὸς Κάϊν. The word πρὸς may have been suggested by πρὸς Ἄβελ of LXX v.8 = Cl v.6.

Ἄβελ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ καὶ ἀνέστη Κάϊν ἐπὶ Ἄβελ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν.

תיטיב לפתח חטאת רבץ ואליך תשוקתו ואתה תמשל-בו [8] ויאמר קין אל-הבל אחיו ויהי בהיותם בשדה ויקם קין אל-הבל

Ex II.14 quoted in Cl IV.10

Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν; μὴ ἀνελεῖν

Ex II.14 מי אמך לאיש שר ושפט עלינו הלהרגני אתה אמר כאשר

LXX Cl-AC(+ δὴ Cl-S) Sam S *L*: - MT T° / καὶ ἀνέστη: -καί Cl.

Ex II.14 ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν LXX Cl-CS, pr. לאיש MT: κριτὴν ἢ δικαστήν Cl-A.

---

necessary clause, διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον, which is wanting in MT. Some of these variants in the LXX can be accounted for as transcriptional errors, but some them presuppose a different Hebrew text.

Ex II.14 The LXX omits לאיש of the MT, and reads θέλεις for אמר.

---

8 διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον] The insertion of these words both in Cl and the LXX completes the sentence of the Hebrew, and it has been suggested that it should be supplied in the Hebrew text.[7] The agreement of Cl with the LXX against the MT is noteworthy.

καὶ ἀνέστη] Cl omits καί. The LXX slavishly follows the MT, but καί here is unnecessary.

This quotation is introduced by the formula γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως.

Ex.II.14 The harmonization of Cl-CS with the LXX is obvious. Li says that Cl must have confused ἄρχοντα καὶ

με σὺ θέλεις, ὅν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον;

הרגת את-המצרי

Gen II.23 quoted in Cl VI.3

ταῦτο νῦν ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός μου.

זאת הפעם עצם מעצמי ובשר מבשרי

ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον LXX-A Cl(χθὲς τὸν Αἰγ. Cl-C): - ἐχθές MT, τὸν Αἰγύπτιον χθές LXX-AMF.

Gen II.23 ὀστέων LXX Cl(Li La GH): ὀσταιων Cl-A, ὀστῶν Cl-C.

The LXX inserts the word ἐχθές, which is followed by Cl.

Gen II.23 עצם מעצמי and בשר מבשרע are rendered respectively ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου and σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός μου(not ὀστοῦν τῶν ὀστέων μου and σὰρξ τῆς σαρκός μου). The LXX thus gives a concrete meaning to the passage. Cl follows the LXX.

δικαστὴν with Lk XII.14 κριτὴν ἢ μεριστήν. Cl follows B in this quotation. The LXX of Ex II.1 is exactly reproduced in Acts VII.27-28, which indicates that Cl is not following Acts in this passage. The quotation has no formula citandi.

Gen II.23 This quotation is taken word for word from the LXX of Gen II.23, but without a formula citandi.

Ez XXXIII.11(Cl VIII.2) A detailed comparison is impossible in such a loose quotation as this. The LXX sentence τὸ ἀποστρέψαι . . . . καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν is expressed in Cl by τὴν μετάνοιαν, perhaps (1) because it offers a better parallel to τὸν θάνατον, and (2) because the word μετάνοια expresses succinctly the meaning of the awkward LXX sentence, and furthermore it is the key word of Cl VII and VIII. ClAlex

Ez XXXIII.11	Cl VIII.2
ζῶ ἐγώ, τάδε λέγει κύριος οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον ταῦ ἀσεβαῦς ὡς τὸ ἀποστρέψαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδαῦ αὐταῦ καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν.	ζῶ γὰρ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον ταῦ ἁμαρτωλαῦ ὡς τὴν μετάναιαν.

חי־אני נאם אדני יהוה אם־אחפץ במות הרשע כי אם־בשוב רשע
מדרכו וחיה

Ez XVIII.30 f.	Cl VIII.3
30 αἶκος Ἰσραήλ, λέγει Κύριος, ἐπιστράφητε καὶ ἀποστρέψατε ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀσεβειῶν ὑμῶν . . . . 31 καὶ ἵνα τί ἀποθνήσκετε, αἶκος Ἰσραήλ; 32 διότι οὐ	Μετανοήσατε, αἶκος Ἰσραήλ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν· εἶπον ταῖς υἱαῖς ταῦ λαοῦ μου. Ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως ταῦ

ζῶ LXX(Cl-C): ζῶ γάρ Cl-AS / τάδε LXX-B: - rel. Cl MT / κύριος LXX-B Cl.

נאם is rendered λέγει. The LXX inserts τάδε which is not in MT.

----

quotes from his namesake, reading οὐ βούλομαι . . . . τὴν μετάναιαν (*de div. Servando* 39). Cf. also Ez XVIII.30 f., Ps CII.11 f., Jer III.19,22, and Is I.18. The quotation is introduced by the words, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησεν μετὰ ὅρκου, but, being short, is probably reproduced from memory.

Ez XVIII.30 f.(Cl VIII.3) A comparison of the LXX and Cl is impossible in such a case as this. As to the origin of this quotation all the scholars are puzzled. The first part may be a confusion of Ez XVIII.30 f. and XXXIII.11, quoted very loosely, or it may be a quotation from an apo-

θέλω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀποθνήσκοντος.

Ez XXXIII.11

εἰπὸν αὐταῖς Ζῶ ἐγώ, τάδε λέγει κύριος Οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς ὡς τὸ ἀποστρέψαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν. ἀποστροφῇ ἀποστρέψατε ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὑμῶν· καὶ ἵνα τί ἀποθνήσκετε, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ.

οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφῆτε πρός με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε· Πάτερ· ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου.

Ez XVIII.30 f. [30]בית ישראל נאם אדני יהוה שובו והשיבו
מכל־פשעיכם . . . [31]ולמה תמותו בית ישראל׃ [32]כי לא אחפץ במות המת׃]
Ez XXXIII.11 חי־אני נאם אדני יהוה אחפץ במות הרשע כי
אם־בשוב ראע מדרכו וחיה שובו שובו מדרכיכם הרעים ולמה
תמותו בית ישראל

Ez XVIII.30 f. The LXX omits אדני / Ez XXXIII.11 The LXX adds τάδε / שובו שובו is rendered ἀποστροφῇ ἀποστρέψατε.

----

cryphon. Ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι κ.τ.λ. is often thought to be a composite of the following passages:

Ps CII.10,11

10 οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ κατὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν ἀνταμέδωκεν ἡμῖν·
11 ὅτι κατὰ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐκραταίωσε Κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν.

Jer III.19,22

19 καὶ εἶπα, Πατέρα καλέσετέ με καὶ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἀποστραφήσεσθε . . . . 22 ἐπι-

Cl VIII.3

Μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν· εἶπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου. Ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφῆτε πρός με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε· Πάτερ· ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου.

στράφητε υἱοὶ ἐπιστρέφοντες
καὶ ἰάσομαι τὰ συντρίμματα ὑμῶν.

Is I.18

καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν
ὡς φοινικαῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ,
ἐὰν δὲ ὦσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς
ἔριον λευκανῶ.

Such composite quotations are not strange among the early Christian writers, and are found also in Cl. But this suggestion leaves the following questions unanswered: (1) It does not take into consideration the words ἐὰν ὦσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου κ.τ.λ. It is improbable that Cl is quoting loosely from Is I.18 here, because in the next verse he is quoting from the passage as an independent quotation. (2) The expression, "and he added a gracious declaration"(προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθήν), which introduces the quotation, may suggest that this passage is taken from the same source as the preceding one, e.g. Ez. (3) A large portion of the quotation is found in two different passages of ClAlex, and he attributes one of them to Ez:

> *Quis dives salvetur 39:* ἔλεον θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν· οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον ταῦ ἁμαρτωλαῦ ἀλλὰ την μετάναιαν· κἂν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικαῦν ἔριον, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ, κἂν μελάντερον ταῦ σκότους, ὡς ἔριον λευκὸν ἐκνίψας ποιήσω.
>
> *Paedag. I.10:* φησὶ γὰρ διʼ Ἰεζεκιήλ· ἐὰν ἐπιστραφῆτε ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε· πάτερ, ακού-

σομαι ὑμῶν ὥσπερ λαοῦ ἁγίου.

There are two other possible explanations. Either it is taken from the text of Ez which was different from ours, as La maintains, or it is a quotation from an uncanonical book falsely ascribed to Ez. The latter suggestion is favored by the account of Josephus (*Ant.* x.5,1), if he is reliable here. He says, "He (Jeremiah) also left behind him in writing a description of that destruction of our nation which has lately happened in our days, and the taking of Babylon; nor was he the only prophet who delivered such predictions beforehand to the multitude; but so did Ezekiel also, who was the first person that wrote, and left behind him in writing two books, concerning these events."

Even if we take for granted that this account is true, we still face a difficulty as to the exact meaning of the words "two books." One cannot be sure whether or not it may simply mean two "parts" of a book. Notwithstanding this ambiguity, it appears that some apocryphal writings ascribed to Ezekiel existed, for Tertullian (*de Carn. Christ.* 23), and others quote as from Ezekiel words not found in the canonical book.

Is I.16-20 (Cl VIII.4) 16 καθαροί] Cl adds καί. Either Cl followed the LXX text supported by 93 and 144, or he quoted from another text without καί, supoorted by the

Is I.16-20 quoted in Cl VIII.4

16 Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, ἀφέλετε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου, παύσασθε ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν, 17 μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν, ἐκζήτησατε κρίσιν, ῥύσασθε ἀδικούμενον, κρίνατε ὀρφανῷ καὶ δικαιώσατε χήραν· 18 καὶ δεῦτε καὶ διελεγχθῶμεν, λέγει κύριος. καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικαῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ, ἐὰν δὲ ὦσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ. 19 καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε καὶ

[16]רחצו הזכו הסירו רע מעלליכם מנגד עיני חדלו הרע [17]למדו
היטב דרשו משפט אשרו חמוץ שפטו יתום ריבו אלמנה [18]לכו-נא
ונוכחה יאמר יהוה אם-יהיו חטאיכם כשנים כשלג ילבינו
אם-יאדימו כתולע כצמר יהיו [19]אם-תאבו ושמעתם טוב הארץ תאכלו

---

16 καθαροί LXX Cl-CS Justin *Apol.* 44,61: καὶ καθαροί Cl-A c. LXX 93 144 / ἀφέλετε LXX Cl-C Justin *Apol.* 44,61: ἀφέλεσθε Cl Justin *Tryph.* 18, -σθαι(= -σθε) itacism Cl-A. / 17 χήραν Ra c. LXX-AS Cl-C, χήρᾳ Sw c. LXX-B*Q 144 147: χήρᾳ He Li La c. Cl-A, χήραν GH c. Cl-C / 18 καί 2° LXX-ASQ Cl: - LXX-B.

---

16 The LXX reads ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν for מעלליכם / παύσασθε ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν for חדלו הרע, which has no equivalent for ἀπό and ὑμῶν / 17 אשרו חמוץ is rendered ῥύσασθε ἀδικούμενον. The word καί is added after them. / 18 The LXX adds καί before לכו-נא and אם-יהיו / כשנים is rendered by a singular. / ילבינו is rendered λαυκανῶ /

---

majority of MSS of the LXX, but A later inserted καί, or Cl inserted it to improve the Greek.

ἀφέλετε] In *Apol.* 44 and 61 Justin ascribes the words to Is, but in *Tryph.* 18 he quotes from memory. Whether he is under the influence of Cl or not is not very clear. In the case of Cl, the form of the preceding verb γένεσθε, may

εἰσακούσητέ μου, τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε· [20]ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μηδὲ εἰσακούσητέ μου, μάχαιρα ὑμας κατέδεται· τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα.

[20]ואם-תמאנו ומריתם חרב תאכלו כי פי יהוה דבר:

Gen XII.1-3 quoted in Cl X.3

1 ἄπελθε ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου καὶ ἐκ ταῦ οἴκου ταῦ πατρός σου εἰς τὴν γὴν, ἣν [ἀν] σοι δείξω· 2 καὶ ποιήσω σε εἰς ἔθνος μέγα, καὶ εὐλογήσω σε καὶ μεγαλυνῶ

[1]לך-לך מארצך וממולדתך ומבית אביך אל-הארץ אשר אראך
[2]ואעשך לגוי גדול ואברכך ואגדלה שמך והיה ברכה

Gen XII.1-3 1 ἔξελθε: - Cl / εἰς τὴν γήν LXX-A Cl MT: pr. καὶ δεῦρο LXX-EM / ἄν LXX-AM Cl: ἐάν LXX-E / 2 εὐλογητός LXX-AE: εὐλογημένος Cl c. LXX-M / 3 τοὺς

καὶ is inserted before "If ye be willing." / μου is wanting after εἰσακούσητε in MT / The LXX has ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μηδὲ εἰσακουσητέ μου for "But if ye refuse and rebel" of MT / κατέδεται for תאכלו. These variants presuppose a different text.

Gen XII.1-3 The LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb.

---

have suggested ἀφέλεσθε.

17 χήραν] The MT has an accusative. If Cl wrote χήρᾳ, it was probably due to his desire to harmonize it with the preceding phrase, κρίνατε ὀρφανῷ, or he simply followed LXX-B.

18 καί 2°] Here Cl agrees with LXX-ASQ against LXX-B in having καί.

This quotation is introduced by the words ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει οὕτως, τόπῳ being the Scriptures and λέγει referring back to ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων of Cl VIII.2.

Gen XII.1-3 1 ἔξελθε] By omission of this word Cl

τὸ ὄνομά σου, καὶ ἔσ' εὐλογητός· [3]καὶ εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογαῦντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι· καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.

[3]ואברכה מברכיך ומקללך אאר ונברכו בך כל משפחת האדמה:

Gen XIII.14-16 quoted in Cl X.4,5

14 ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἴδε ἀπὸ ταῦ τόπου, οὗ νῦν σὺ εἶ, πρὸς βορρᾶν καὶ λίβα καὶ ἀνατολὰς καὶ θάλασσαν· 15 ὅτι πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, ἣν συ ὁρᾷς, σοὶ δώσω αὐτὴν καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου ἕως ταῦ αἰῶνος. 16 καὶ ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου

Gen XIII.14-16 [14]שא נא עיניך וראה מן־המקום אשר־אתה שם צפנה
ונגבה וקדמה וימה [15]כי את־כל־הארץ אשר־אתה ראה לך אתננה

καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι LXX c. MT: καταράσομαι τοὺς καταρωμένους σε Cl / εὐλογηθήσονται LXX-A Cl: ἐνευλογηθήσονται LXX-DEM.

Gen XIII.14-16 15 ἣν συ ὁρᾷς LXX Cl-AS: - Cl-C / ἕως ταῦ αἰῶνος LXX Cl-C: om. ταῦ Cl-A / 16 γῆς 1° LXX-AMD

Gen XIII.14-16 14 נא is no way represented by the LXX, neither ו of וראה. νῦν before σὺ εἶ is not in the MT.

---

improves the Greek.

2 εὐλογητός] Cl reads εὐλογημένος, but the Heb. word ברכה is better translated by the word εὐλογητός. Cl's reading improves the Greek.

3 τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι] The transposition of these words in Cl is probably due to a transcriptional error.

In this quotation Cl does not follow any single MS of the LXX, although its closer relation with A is manifest. The citation is introduced by the words λέγει γὰρ αὐτῷ.

ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τῆς τῆς· εἰ δύναταί τις ἐξαριθμῆσαι τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐξαριθμηθήσεται.

ולזרעך עד־עולם [16]ושמתי את־זרעך כעפר הארץ אשר אם־יוכל
איש למנות את־עפר הארץ גם־זרעך ימנה:

Gen XV.5,6 quoted in Cl X.6

5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἀνάβλεψον δη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀρίθησον τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξ-

Gen XV.5,6 [5]ויוצא אתו החוצה ויאמר הבט־נא השמימה וספר
הכוכבים אם־תוכל לספר אתם ויאמר לו כה יהיה זרעך

Cl: θαλάσσης LXX-E / ἐξαριθμηθήσεται Ra c. 911 Cl: ἀριθμηθήσεται Sw BMT c. Cl-A.

Gen XV.5,6 5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω: ἐξήγαγεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ Cl-A(ἐξήγαγε δέ Cl-CS) / αὐτῷ Ra c. LXX-LM Cl: πρὸς αὐτόν Sw BMT c. LXX-D, - MT / δή: - Cl /

Gen XV.5,6 5 αὐτῷ is added to εἶπεν. הבט is rendered ἀνάβλεψον. לו after ויאמר is not in the LXX. 6 Ἀβραμ is not in MT.

----

15 ἕως ταῦ αἰῶνος] The editors of Cl read without τοῦ. The phrase ἕως αἰῶνος is a common expression. For the insertion of τοῦ, see Deut XXVIII.46(- LXX-A), Jos IV.7, I Kgs XX.15, II Kgs VII.25(- LXX-A), etc.

Cl's quotation is almost an exact copy of the LXX of Gen XIII.14-16, although it is hard to determine which MS he follows. It has a formula citandi, εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός.

Gen XV.5,6 5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω] The word δέ corresponds to the Hebrew conjunction, which is not necessary for Cl's context. The LXX omits θεός and Ἀβραάμ because they are already mentioned in the preceding verses. The

αριθμῆσαι αὐτούς. καὶ εἶπεν οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου. 6καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβρὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

[6]והאמן ביהוה ויחשבה לו צדקה:

Jer IX.22,23	Cl XIII.1
22 μη καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφία αὐταῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐταῦ,	μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐταῦ μηδὲ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ μηδὲ ὁ

καὶ εἶπεν: - Cl(+ αὐτῷ MT) / 6 Ἀβρααμ Cl, - MT.

Jer IX.22,23(Cl XIII.1) 22 καὶ μή 1° 2°: μηδέ Cl / καυχάσθω 2° 3°: - Cl.

Jer IX.22,23 22 LXX adds καί before the third μὴ καυχάσθη. 23 אותי is omitted in the LXX. The Greek is better without it. LXX inserts καί before κρίμα.

----

word ἔξω is a faithful translation of החוצה. The Greek however is better without it.

δή and καὶ εἶπεν] The Greek is better without these words. Cl agrees with the LXX against MT in omitting αὐτῷ.

Cl's quotation is introduced by the formula, πάλιν λέγει.

Jer IX.22,23(Cl XIII.1) A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX of Jer IX.23 is impossible. The form ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθω, which is not found in either Jer or II Sam, is found in I Cor I.31 and II Cor X.17. Two suppositions are possible in order to explain this: (1) Paul had loosely quoted from Jer or I Sam, and Cl, being familiar with Paul's expression, incorporated it into his quotation from the OT passage, or (2) there was a different recension

καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, 23 ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.	πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην.
I Sam II.10	I Cor I.31
μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.	ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. II Cor X.17 ὁ [δὲ] καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω.

Jer IX.22,23 [22]אל-יתהלל חכם בחכמתו ואל-יתהלל הגבור בגבורתו
אל-יתהלל עשיר בעשרו [23]כי אם-בזאת יתהלל המתהלל השכל וידע אותי
כי אני יהוה עשה חסד משפט וצדקה בארץ:
I Sam II.10 יהוה יחתו מריבו עלו בשמים ירעם יהוה ידין
אפסי-ארץ ויתן-עז למלכו וירם קרן משיחו:

Is LXVI.2 quoted in Cl XIII.4

Ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν ταπεινὸν καὶ ἡσύχιον

Is LXVI.2 ταπεινόν: πραῢν Cl(-ον Cl-C)

---

of Jer and I Sam in the apostolic age, and both Paul and Cl quoted from it. Li supports the first supposition, which appears to be more probable. In this connection the MT, which is faithfully translated by the LXX, gives us no aid. Irenaeus' quotation (iv.17.3) of Jer IX.23 is exactly

καὶ τρέμοντα τοὺς λόγους μου;

Is LXVI.2 ואל־זה אביט אל־עני ונכה־רוח וחרד על־דברי

τοὺς λόγους μου: μου τὰ λόγια Cl (τοὺς λογούς Cl-C)

ואל־זה is rendered ἐπὶ τίνα. The Greek is better and more effective with this reading. LXX inserts ἀλλ'. נכה־רוח is rendered ἡσύχιον. דברי is made plural in the LXX. These variants presuppose a different text.

---

like the LXX passage. I Sam II.10 in the MT is much shorter and very different from the LXX. Cl's passage is probably a loose quotation of Jer. It is introduced by the words, ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον, λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

Is LXVI.2 ταπεινόν] Cl reads πραΰν. They are similar in meaning. Hatch however distinguishes πραΰς from ταπεινός. According to him, πραΰς (πρᾶος) is "easy-tempered" as distinguished from ὀργίλος, "passionate," whereas ταπεινός is not only "lowly," but almost always also "dejected" and "mean-spirited."[8] In fact, Cl has already used the word ταπεινοφρονῶν, which, in his mind, includes the three virtues mentioned in this quotation. Therefore he must have avoided using ταπεινός again.

τοὺς λόγους μου] Cl uses τὰ λόγια and τοὺς λόγους interchangeably (λόγια = XIII.4 cit., XIX.1, LIII.1, LXII.3; λόγους = II.1, XXXV.8 cit., LVII.4 cit.). In Cl XXXV.8 (Ps L.17), both Cl and the LXX read τοὺς λόγους μου(דברי), where τοὺς λόγους is used in the same sense as in Is LXVI.2.

Prov II.21,22	Cl XIV.4
21 χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτεορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι εὐθεῖς κατασκηνώσουσι γῆν, καὶ ὅσιοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ· 22 ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται, αἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξωσθήσονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς.	χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐπ' αὐτῆς. αἱ δὲ παρανομοῦντες ἐξολεθρευθήσονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς.

Prov II.21,22 [21]כי־ישרים ישכנו־ארץ ותמימים יותרו בה
[22]ורשעים מארץ יכרתו ובוגדים יסחו ממנה:

Prov II.21,22 21 כי is omitted in LXX / LXX adds ὅτι εὐθεῖς . . . . ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ / 22 ורשעים is rendered ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν, omitting καὶ and inserting ὁδοί / בוגדים is rendered αἱ παράνομοι.

The transposition of μου is difficult to account for. The LXX diverges from the MT, and its variants indicate that Cl is closer to the LXX than to the MT. The quotation is introduced by the words φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος.

Prov II.21,22(Cl XIV.4) A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX is impossible in a case like this. The first of the quotation is found in Prov II.21, which is missing in the LXX-B. The only difference between Cl and the LXX is ἐπ' αὐτῆς Cl for ἐν αὐτῇ LXX. ἐν αὐτῇ is a literal translation of the word בה. Cl avoids this Hebraism, reading ἐπ' αὐτῆς which seems to be the better Greek.

The words αἱ δὲ παρανομοῦντες ἐξολεθρευθήσονται of Cl are found in Ps XXXVI.38, and ἀπ' αὐτῆς in Prov II.22. This

Ps XXXVI.38	Ps XXXVI.9
αἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξολεθρευθήσονται ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, τὰ ἐγκαταλείμματα τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐξολεθρευθήσονται.	ὅτι αἱ πονηρευόμενοι ἐξολεθρευθήσονται, αἱ δὲ ὑπομένοντες τὸν κύριον αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν.

Ps XXXVII.38 ופשעים נשמדו יחדו אחרית רשעים נכרתה:
Ps XXXVII.9 כי מרעים יכרתון וקוי יהוה המה יירשו־ארץ:

Ps XXXVI.35-37 quoted in Cl XIV.5

35 εἶδον ἀσεβῆ ὑπερυψούμενον καὶ ἐπαιρόμενον ὡς τὰς κέδρους ταῦ Λιβάνου· 36 καὶ παρῆλθον, καὶ ἰδαῦ οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ἐζήτησα

Ps XXXVII.35-37 [35]ראיתי רשע עריץ ומתערה כאזרח רענן [36]ויעבר

Ps XXXVI.35-37(Cl XIV.5) 35 εἶδον LXX-BAS Cl(La Li GH c. Cl-CS): ἴδον LXX-T Cl-A / ἀσεβῆ LXX-B Cl(-ν Cl-A): pr. τόν LXX-AS$^{c.a.}$T Cl-C AlAlex *Strom.*IV.VI.32 / 36

Ps XXXVII.9 and Ps XXXVII.38 are faithful translations of the Heb.

Ps XXXVI.35-37 35 עריץ is rendered ὑπερυψούμενον. Ki proposes to read עליז = עליץ / מתערה is rendered ἐπαιρόμενον, therefore Ki proposes to read מתעלה / כאזרח רענן is rendered ὡς τὰς κέδρους ταῦ Λιβάνου. Ki proposes to read כארז הלבנן, but Briggs is opposed to this reading /

---

quotation is apparently a conflation of the passages of Prov and Ps. Its formula citandi is γέγραπται γάρ.

Ps XXXVI.35-37 36 ἐζήτησα] Cl seems to prefer ἐκζητέω ιο ζητέω, for he uses it also in VIII.4 and XIII.1, whereas he never uses ζητέω.

αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐχ κ.τ.λ.] Cl's reading is evidently an improvement on the Greek of the LXX.

αὐτόν, καὶ οὐχ εὑρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐταῦ. 37 φύλασσε ἀκακίαν καὶ ἴδε εὐθύτητα, ὅτι ἔστιν ἐγκατάλειμμα ἀνθρώπῳ εἰρηνικῷ.

והנה איננו ואבקשהו ולא נמצא[37]שמר־תם וראה ישר כי־אחרית לאיש שלום

Is XXIX.13	Cl XV.2
ἐγγίζει μαι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ταῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσίν με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμαῦ.	οὗτος ὁ λαὸς ταῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ’ ἐμαῦ.
Mk VII.6	**Mt XV.8**
οὗτος ὁ λαὸς ταῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμαῦ.	ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ταῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμου.

Is XXIX.13 יען כי נגש העם הזה בפיו ובשפתיו כבדוני ולבו רחק ממני

ἐζήτησα: ἐξεζήτησα Cl / αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐχ εὑρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ LXX Cl-S: τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐχ εὗρον Cl-AC.

Is XXIX.13(Cl XV.2) ἐγγίζει μαι (ἐγγ. μου S*): - Cl Mt Mk ClAlex *Strom.* IV.VI.32 / ὁ λαὸς οὗτος LXX Cl-C II-Cl III.5 Mt Mk(BD): tr. Cl Mk, ὁ γὰρ λαὸς ὁ ἕτερος ClAlex *ibid* / ταῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν: τῷ στόματί Cl-C, - αὐτῶν Cl ClAlex, pr. ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐταῦ καὶ ἐν Sw c. LXX-BMT *L* Mt(CEF Pe) / τιμῶσιν: τιμᾷ Cl ClAlex *Ibid*, ἀγαπᾷ Mk (WD) / ἀπέχει LXX Mk Mt Cl-C: ἄπεστιν Cl Mk(L) ClAlex *Ibid.*

----

36 ויעבר is rendered ואעבר, Ki proposes to read so with the LXX, Jerome, and Syriac / LXX adds ὁ τόπος αὐταῦ after οὐχ εὑρέθη probably to clarify the sentence, but Cl's insertion of these words after ἐζήτητα is better / תָם is rendered ἀκακίαν. Ki therefore proposes to read תֹם with the LXX, Jerome, and Syriac / וראה, which is properly rendered ἴδε, is proposed by Ki to read ורעה / יָשָׁר is renderd εὐθύτητα, and Ki proposes the reading יֹשֶׁר with the LXX, Jerome, and Syriac. These variants are best accounted for

by the supposition that the text of the LXX was different from that of the MT.

Is XXIX.13(Cl XV.2) יען כי is omitted in the LXX / LXX adds μοι after ἐγγέζει, but omits בפיו ו־. These variants can be accounted for by the supposition of the different text of the LXX.

Cl follows MS-B of the LXX in this passage. The formula citandi is πάλιν λέγει.

Is XXIX.13(Cl XV.2) ἐγγίζει μοι] These words are not needed for Cl's context. Hatch says, "It is a legitimate inference that, before the time of Clement, the quotation had become detached from its context, and that οὗτος ὁ λαός, having lost its proper predicate ἐγγίζει, and having assimilated the following predicate τιμῶσι (which thereby became τιμᾷ), the antithesis was accentuated by the loss of one or other of the phrases ἐν τῷ στόματι or ἐν ταῖς χείλεσι."[9] His inference, he argues, is substantiated by all MSS of Mk, some good MSS of Mt, and all the early Latin quotations of the passage.

ὁ λαὸς οὗτος] Cl and Mk transpose the words. It is probable that Cl is under the influence of Mk in transposing the words. ClAlex reads ὁ ἕτερος for οὗτος to suit his context, although he follows Cl.

ταῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν] Cl omits αὐτῶν either because he follows Mk and Mt or because he has αὐτῶν in the following

Ps LXI.5 quoted in Cl XV.3

τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν εὐλογαῦσαν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν κατηρῶντο.

בפיו יברכו ובקרבם יקללו

εὐλογαῦσαν LXX-BSR Li GH, -γοῦν LXX-B^{b}S$^{c.a.}$T Cl-C: εὐλογαῦσιν La c. Cl-A ClAlex *Strom.*IV.VI.32(εὐλογαῦσι) / καὶ τῇ LXX Cl-S: τῇ δέ Cl-AC ClAlex *Ibid.*

בפיו is rendered τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν. Ki proposes the reading בפיהם with the LXX, Syriac and Targum. If this is a correct reading, then that of the MT is probably due to a transcriptional error.

---

clause.

τιμῶσιν] Cl reads τιμᾷ. See Hatch's explanation above for this change.

ἀπέχει] See notes on Cl III.4.

Cl is nearer to Mk and Mt than to the LXX. II Cl(III.5) quotes the same passage with the formula, λέγει δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ 'Ησαΐᾳ. His language is exactly the same as that of Cl, except that he transposes οὗτος ὁ λαός. Justin (*Dial.*78) quotes from the LXX word for word. The words λέγει γὰρ που introduces Cl's quotation from the LXX, which diverges from the MT.

Ps. LXI.5 εὐλογαῦσαν] Kn states that εὐλογαῦσαν is 3 pl. imp., and that the ending -σαν instead of -ν was making headway(vordringen) in the Koine.[10] He gives the conjugation of the modern Greek imperfect as follows: ηὐλογαῦσα, -σες, -σε, -σαμεν, -σετε, -σαν. The text of Li and GH

Ps LXXVII.36,37 quoted in Cl XV.4

36 [καὶ] ἠπάτησαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν καὶ τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτῶν ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ, 37 ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν οὐκ εὐθεῖα μετ' αὐταῦ, οὐδὲ ἐπιστώθησαν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ αὐταῦ.

Ps LXXVIII.36,37 36ויפתוהו בפיהם ובלשונם יכזבו־לו
37ולבם לא־נכון עמו ולא נאמנו בבריתו:

---

36 ἠπάτησαν Ra c. LXX-T, ἠγάπησαν Sw c. LXX-BS: ἠγάπησαν Cl ClAlex *Strom.*IV.VI.32 / ἐν τῷ στόματι: - ἐν Cl / ἐψεύσαντο: ἐψεύσαντο Li La c. Cl-AS ClAlex *Ibid*, ἔψεξαν GH c. Cl-C / αὐτῷ LXX-BS, αὐτόν LXX-T: αὐτόν Cl ClAlex *Ibid.*

LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb.

(εὐλογαῦσαν) probably is preferable here.

καὶ τῇ] Cl improves the Greek by reading δὲ for καί. That he is quoting from the LXX is apparent, for both have τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν where the MT has "with his mouth." The quotation is introduced by the formula, καὶ πάλιν.

Ps LXXVII.36,37 ἠπάτησαν] Li thinks that ἠπάτησαν was probably the original reading of the LXX.[11] The word ἠγάπησαν gives a better parallel to ἐψεύσαντο. Cl here follows LXX-B.

ἐν τῷ στόματι] ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν is a literal translation of בפיהם. Cl omits ἐν in accordance with the expression in the preceding verse, and thus improves the Greek.

αὐτῷ] It perhaps is a literal translation of the Hebrew word לו, which is improved by Cl in reading αὐτόν. The quotation has the formula, πάλιν λέγει.

Ps XXX.19 quoted in Cl XV.5

ἄλαλα γενηθήτω τὰ χείλη τὰ δόλια τὰ λαλαῦντα κατὰ ταῦ δικαίου ἀνομίαν.

Ps XXXI.19 תאלמנה שפתי שקר הדברות על-צדיק עתק

ἄλαλα: ἄλαλα Li La, pr. διὰ ταῦτο GH / γενηθήτω Ra c. LXX-ASRU, γεγηθήτωσαν Sw c. LXX-B: γενηθήτω Cl-A ClAlex, γενηθείη Cl-C / τὰ λαλαῦντα . . . . ἀνομίαν: = Li La c. Cl-S, om. GH c. Cl-AC AlAlex *Strom.* IV.VI.33, GHZ has τὰ λαλαῦντα . . . . τὰ χείλη τὰ δόλια in brackets.

LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb.

ἄλαλα] Concerning the inclusion of διὰ ταῦτο in Cl's quotation by GH, Li says, "This should not be trated as part of the quotation, since it is not found in any of the passages of the Psalms which are here strung together."[12]

τὰ λαλαῦντα κ.τ.λ.] This omission, supported by AC, ClAlex, is a case of homoeoteleuton, the ending of the both sentences being τὰ χείλη τὰ δόλια. Only S has this. La says, "It is probable that this is a primitive corruption in the text, and that the reading of S is a correct emendation."[13] This emendation was made by Li independently before the text of S was ever discovered. This passages proves that ClAlex was quoting Cl. Cl's quotation is an exact duplication of the LXX, althoogh it has no formula citandi.

Ps XI.4-6 quoted in Cl XV.5-7

4 ἐξολεθρεύσαι κύριος πάντα τὰ χείλη τὰ δόλια καὶ γλῶσσαν μεγαλορήμονα 5 ταῦς εἰπόντας Τὴν γλῶσσαν ἡμῶν μεγαλυναῦμεν, τὰ χείλη ἡμῶν παρ' ἡμῶν ἐστιν; τίς ἡμῶν κύριός εστιν; 6 ἀπὸ

Ps XII.4-6 [4]יכרת יהוה כל־שפתי חלקות לשון מדברת גדלות
[5]אשר אמרו ללשננו נגביר שפתינו אתנו מי אדון לנו

---

4 καὶ γλῶσσαν: - καί Cl c. LXX-S$^{c.a.}$ MT / 6 ἀπὸ ταῦ στεναγμαῦ: - ἀπό Cl-CS ClAlex *Strom.* IV.VI.33 LXX-S$^{c.a.}$RU, + ἀπό Li c. Cl-A / ἐν σωτηρίᾳ, -ῳ LXX-AS$^{c.a.}$R^{a}: ἐν

----

4 יכרת is rendered ἐξολεθρεύσαι / חלקות is rendered τὰ δόλια / LXX adds καί after δόλια / 5 אמרו is rendered τὴν γλῶσσαν ἡμῶν, and Ki proposes to read לשננו without ל with the LXX and Syriac / אדון לנו is rendered ἡμῶν Κύριος /

----

6 ἀπὸ ταῦ στεναγμαῦ] This repetition of ἀπὸ is in accord with the Hebrew. But it is not necessary, and Cl omits it.

ἐν σωτηρίᾳ] Cl employs the word σωτηρία in XVIII.14, XLV.1, and VII.7 in the sense of "salvation." Thus it is probable that Cl changed ἐν σωτηρίᾳ of the LXX, where simply "safety" is meant, into ἐν σωτηρίῳ. The quotation is preceded by the formula, καὶ πάλιν.

Hatch maintains that the last three quotations form a composite quotation. Although this composite quotation is divided into three parts by the insertion of the words, πάλιν λέγει, or καὶ πάλιν λέγει, in Cl, the same grouping is found in ClAlex *Strom.* IV.6, where there is no such distinction between the quotations. Therefore Hatch concludes

τῆς ταλαιπωρίας τῶν πτωχῶν καὶ ἀπὸ ταῦ στεναγμαῦ τῶν πενήτων νῦν ἀναστήσομαι, λέγει κύριος, θήσομαι ἐν σωτηρίᾳ παρρησιάσομαι ἐν αὐτῳ.

[6]משד עניים מאנקת אביונים עתה אקום יאמר יהוה אשית בישע יפיח לו:

Is LIII.1-12 quoted in Cl XVI.3-14

1 κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκαῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; 2 ἀνηγγείλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐταῦ ὡς παιδίον, ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώθῃ, οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῳ οὐδὲ δόξα· καὶ εἴδομεν αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος· 3 ἀλλὰ τὸ

[1]מי האמין לשמעתנו וזרוע יהוה על־מי נגלתה [2]ויעל כיונק לפניו
וכשרש מארץ ציה לא־תאר לו ולא הדר ונראהו ולא־מראה ונחמדהו

σωτηρίῳ Cl ClAlex *Ibid*, om. Cl-C, ἐν σωτηρίᾳ or ἐν σωτηρίῳ Cl-S.

---

6 LXX adds καί after πτωχῶν / יפיח is rendered παρρησιάσομαι. Some of these variants are apparently due to transcriptional errors, but others are hard to explain. The text of the LXX was probably different from that of the MT.

---

that both groups of quotations must have come from the common source.[14]

The nature of this common source we have already discussed in the Prolegomena.[15] He does not think that ClAlex quoted from his Roman namesake. Unfortunately Hatch has overlooked the fact that the entire six, not the last three as he says, quotations are strung together by ClAlex in *Strom.* IV.6, without hinting that he is quoting from a previous writer. That this string of quotations is borrowed from Cl is obvious from the insertion of the words διὰ ταῦτο, which are not found in the LXX. He follows Cl of Rome even in the

εἶδος αὐταῦ ἄτιμον ἐκλεῖπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν καὶ εἰδὼς φέρειν, μαλακίαν, ὅτι ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐταῦ, ἠτιμάσθη καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη. 4 οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει. 5 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν· παιδεία εἰρηνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν, τῷ μώλωπι αὐταῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. 6 πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν,

[3]נבזה וחדל אישים איש מכאבות וידוע חלי וכמסתר פנים ממנו
ובזה ולא חשבנהו [4]אכן חלינו הוא נשא ומכאבינו סבלם ואנחנו
חשבנהו נגוע מכה אלהים ומענה [5]והוא מחלל מפשעינו מדכא
מעונותינו מוסר שלומנו עליו ובחברתו נרפא־לנו [6]כלנו

---

2 ἐναντίον αὐταῦ ὡς παιδίον Ra c.LXX-AS, ὡς παιδίον ἐναντίον αὐταῦ Sw c. LXX-BC MT: Cl = LXX-AS / εἶδος αὐτῷ: tr. Cl / 3 ἐκλεῖπον, pr. καί LXX-BS: = Cl / πάντας ἀνθρώπους Ra c. LXX-AQ, τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων Sw c. LXX-B *L*, πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθ. LXX-SC: τὸ εἶδος τῶν ἀνθρώπων Cl-AC, πάντας ἀνθρώπους Cl-S c. LXX-AQ / ὢν: + καὶ πόνῳ

---

1 LXX adds κύριε before τίς ἐπίστευσεν / 2 ויעל is rendered ἀνηγγείλαμεν / LXX tr. ἐναντίον αὐταῦ . . . . ὡς παιδίον (LXX-B = MT) / מארץ is rendered ἐν γῇ / LXX adds ἔστιν before εἶδος 1° / LXX adds εἶχεν before εἶδος 2° /

---

remarkable omission, ἄλαλα γενηθήτω κ.τ.λ. In addition to this, he concludes the quotation with the words of Cl, ταπεινοφρονούντων γάρ . . . . τὸ παίμνιον αὐταῦ (Cl XVI.1), as if they are his own.

Is LIII.1-12 2 εἶδος αὐτῷ] The LXX represents the MT faithfully in reading εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα. Cl transposes the first two words in accordance with the form εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος in the same verse.

ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐταῦ ἐπλαμήθη· καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. 7 καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα· ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον ταῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐταῦ. 8 ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐταῦ ἤρθη· τὴν

כצאן תעינו איש לדרכו פנינו ויהוה הפגיע בו את עון כלנו
[7]נגש והוא נענה ולא יפתח־פיו כשה לטבח יובל וכרחל לפני
גזזיה נאלמה ולא יפתח פיו [8]מעצר וממשפט לקח ואת־דורי מי

Cl / 4 εἶναι, om. LXX-S*V: = Cl / πόνῳ, πόνοις LXX-S*: = Cl / 5 ἀνομίας . . . . ἁμαρτίας Ra c. LXX-AS, tr. Sw c. LXX-B: tr. Cl-A c. LXX-B, = Cl-CS Bar V.2 / 6 ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν: ὑπερ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν Cl Cyp *Testim.* 2.13 Lactant *Instit.* 4.16 Jerome *Isai.* 53 tom.iv.615, ταῖς ἁμαρτίαῖς ἡμῶν Cl-S / 7 κείροντος, καίραντος LXX-AS: καίραντος Cl c. LXX-AS / αὐτόν Ra c. LXX-S$^{c.a.}$AQ, om. Sw c. LXX-

----

ונחמעהו is rendered οὐδὲ κάλλος omitting חן / 3 LXX adds ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐταῦ before ἄτιμον, and omits καί before ἐκλεῖπον / LXX adds παρὰ πάντας in order to make the meaning of the sentence clear. / LXX adds ὢν after πληγῇ / LXX adds φέρειν before μαλακίαν / LXX reads ὅτι ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐταῦ for וכמסתר פנים ממנו, changing the meaning completely, i.e. from "and as one from whom men hide their face" to "because his face was turned away." / ולא חשבנהו is rendered καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη / 4 LXX omits אכן / חלינו

----

3 πάντας ἀνθρώπους] Concerning these variants, Hatch says, "None of these translations, in either Clement or the LXX, corresponds to the Hebrew of this verse; but the difference between Clement and the LXX affords a remarkable proof that the translation has been transferred to this place from c. 52. 14, for each of the translations is a possible translation of the latter half of that verse."[17]

γενεὰν αὐταῦ τίς διηγήσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐταῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν ταῦ λααῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον. 9 καὶ δώσω τοὺς πνηραῦς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐταῦ καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ ταῦ θανάτου αὐταῦ· ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐπαίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐταῦ. 10 καὶ κύριος βούλεται

ישוחח כי נגזר מארץ חיים מפשע עמי נגע למו [9]ויתן את־רשעים קברו
ואת־עשיר במתיו על לא־חמס עשה ולא מרמה בפיו [10]ויהוה

BS*C: - Cl / 8 ἤχθη, ἥκει LXX-Q^{mg}: ἥκει Cl-AC, ἤχθη Cl-S / 10 βούλεται κύριος: tr. Cl c. LXX-S.

---

is rendered τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, and נשא φέρει / LXX reads καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται for ומכאבינו סבלם / LXX adds εἶναι after ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτόν / LXX translates מכה אלהים ומענה נגוע ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει / 5 מפשעינו is rendered διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν / מעונותינו is rendered διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν / מדכא is rendered μεμαλάκισται / מחלל and ἐτραυματίσθη are alike in meaning but different in tense / 6 פנינו is rendered ἐπλανήθη / הפגיע is rendered παρέδωκεν / עון is rendered ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις / בו is missing in the LXX, and so is כלנו / The second half of v.6 in the LXX is different from the MT in meaning: LXX reads,"and the Lord delivered him for our sins," while MT reads,"and Yahweh laid on him the iniquity of us all." The LXX translator could not have misunderstood the Hebrew, because it clearly indicates by את that עון is a direct object and not an indirect object as LXX has it. The original text of the LXX was probably different from that of the MT. / 7 נגש is missing in LXX / נענה ו־ is rendered διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι / נגזיה is rendered

---

ὧν] Cl adds καὶ πόνῳ. Li thinks that the words must have crept in from below, ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ(Cl XVI.4 = Is LIII.4), either by a lapse of memory on Cl's part or by an error in his copy of the LXX or in the transcription of Cl's own text. Cl however could not possible have been

καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς· ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας, ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον· καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν 11 ἀπὸ ταῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐταῦ, δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει,κικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλαῖς, καὶ τὰς

חפץ דכאו החלי אם־תשים אשם נפשו יראה זרע יאריך ימים וחפץ
יהוה בידו יצלח [11]מעמל נפשו יואה ישבע בדעתו יצדיק צדיק

ταῦ κείροντος αὐτόν / LXX adds οὕτως after ἄφωνος and omits καὶ before οὐκ / 8 מעצר וממשפט לקח is rendered ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐταῦ ἤρθη / ישוחח is rendered διηγήσεται / כי נגזר מארץ חיים is rendered ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐταῦ / נגע למו is rendered ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον: Ki suggests to read נגע למות / 9 ויתן is rendered καὶ δώυω / LXX adds ἀντὶ before τῆς ταφῆς and ταῦ θανάτου / LXX adds εὑρέθη before δόλος. / 10 ויהוה חפץ דכאו החלי is rendered καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς (probably reading בחלי for החלי), thus changing the meaning altogether. The rest of the verse is also different from the MT. For "when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see (his) seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Yahweh shall prosper in his hand," the LXX reads ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας, ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον / וחפץ יהוה בידו יצלח is rendered καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν, probably reading להציל for יצלח and חֵפֶץ for חָפֵץ and omitting בידו. This reading explains the different reading of the LXX in the next verse. / 11 Wade says that this verse

---

quoting from memory -- the passage is long, and the quotation is fairly exact -- it was due either to his error or to the transcription of his text.

5 ἀνομίας . . . . ἁμαρτίας] עון (pl. עונוא) = perversiveness, sin, guilt. פשע = sin, transgression, wickedness. These two wordx can be translated either ἀνομίας or ἁμαρτίας, and the transposition may be due to the error of the scribe

ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀναίσει. 12 διὰ ταῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν περιεῖ σκῦλα, ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς

עבדי לרבים ועונתם הוא יסבל [12]לכן אחלק-לו ברבים ואת-עצומים

---

in the Hebrew text seems defective. [16] The LXX connects יצלח (reading להציל) with v. 11, changing the meaning of v. 11 altogether. / It renders יראה by δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς, apparently reading יראהו and adding אור / LXX reads ישבע בדעתו together (καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει) / For לרבים . . . . יצדיק, LXX reads δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύ-

---

in transcribing Cl's text.

6 ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν] The expression with ὑπέρ sounds better. The change of the case of the noun after ὑπέρ is necessary.

7 κείροντος] This is probably a transcriptional error. The meaning is the same whether present or aorist.

αὐτόν] Cl omits it. The word αὐτόν of the LXX has its equivalent in the Hebrew, but it is unnecessary in Cl's passage.

10 βούλεται κύριος] This transposition may be due to the error of transcription.

Cl's quotation is introduced by the words, ... καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐταῦ ἐλάλησεν· φησὶν γάρ. It will not be out of place to quote the words of Knopf with regard to this quotation: "Kain Text des AT wird in der frühchristlichen Literatur so oft ganz oder teilweise angeführt wie Is. 53. Das Kap. hat eine grosse, grund-

θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη· καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

יחלק שלל תחת אשר הערה למות נפשו ואת־פשעים נמנה והוא
חטא־רבים נשא ולפשעים יפגיע:

Ps XXI.7-9 quoted in Cl XVI.15,16

7 ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ὄνειδος ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐξουδένημα λαοῦ. 8 πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλήν 9 Ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον,

Ps XXII.7-9 [7]ואנכי תולעת ולא־איש חרפת אדם ובזוי עם [8]כל־ראי

Ps XXI.7-9 7 ἀνθρώπου, -ων LXX-SRU: ἀνθρώπων Cl / ἐξουδένημα: ἐξουθένημα Cl c. LXX-ASR.

οντα πολλαῖς / 12 אחלק־לי is rendered αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει, changing the subject in harmony with the preceding verse / For יפגיע the LXX has παρεδόθη / LXX adds αὐτῶν after τὰς ἁμαρτίας.

Ps XXI.7-9 8 יפטירו בשפה is rendered ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, but the meaning is the same / 9 גל is rendered ἤλπισεν (Talmud has ישבה. Mt XXVII.43 reads πέποιθεν. Syriac reads גל).

---

legende Bedeutung für die altchristliche Frömmigkeit und für die sich bildende messianische Dogmatik."[18]

Ps XXI.7-9 7 ἀνθρώπου] This word is a literal translation of אדם, but Cl changes it probably to harmonize with its parallel λαοῦ of the same verse.

ἐξουδένημα] Cl has ἐξουθένημα, but the meaning remains the same. The quotation has the formula citandi, καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸς φησιν.

ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν· σωσάτο αὐτόν, ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν.

ילעיגו לי יפטירו בשפה יניעו ראש [9]גל אל־יהוה יפלטהו יצילהו
כי חפץ בו:

Gen XVIII.27 quoted in Cl XVII.2

ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι γῆ καὶ σποδός. ואנכי עפר ואפר:

Job I.1	Cl XVII.3
Ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ἐν χώρᾳ τῇ Αὐσίτιδι, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰώβ, καὶ ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηραῦ πράγματος.	Ἰὼβ δὲ ἦν δίκαιος καὶ ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινός, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ.
	איש היה בארץ־עוץ איוב שמו והיה האיש ההוא תם וישר וירא אלהים וסר מרע:

Job I.1 LXX has τις which is wanting in the MT / LXX reads Αὐσίτιδι for עוץ / Job's character is described in the MT as "perfect and upright," but the LXX reads, ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος / ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ μαντὸς πονηραῦ πράγματος for וסר מרע. These variants verify the words of Driver and Gray concerning the LXX text of Job, "G[the LXX] here, as elsewhere, points to the existence of now lost MSS that differed more extensively. Unfortunately the determination of the Hebrew text lying behind G is rendered peculiarly difficult in Job by the fact that the version is often free and paraphrastic."[19]

Gen XVIII.27 Although it is not accompanied by a formula citandi, it is apparently taken from Gen XVIII.27. Its context, which refers to Abraham, confirms this view. The LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb. Therefore, it is hard to determine which text Cl followed, but the fact that ו conjuntive is translated δέ alike in both Cl and the LXX may point to the LXX as the sonrce.

Job XIV.4,5a	Cl XVII.4
4 τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ῥύπου; ἀλλ' οὐθείς. 5 ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐταῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. . . .	οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδ' ἂν μιᾶς ἡμέρας ἡ ζωὴ αὐταῦ.

[4]מי־יתן טהור מטמא לא אחד: [5a]אם־חרוצים ימיו

Num XII.7	Cl XVII.5
οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωϋσῆς· ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ αἶκῳ μου πιστός ἐστιν.	[Μωϋσῆς] πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ αἶκῳ αὐταῦ [ἐκλήθη].
לא־כן עבדי משה בכל־ביתי נאמן הוא	Heb III.2 . . . . πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ αἶκῳ αὐταῦ.

Num XII.7 αἶκῳ αὐταῦ Cl-AS(om. αὐταῦ Cl-C).

Job XIV.4,5a LXX insert γάρ after τίς / LXX reads ἔσται for יתן / LXX adds ἀλλ' before οὐθείς / ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐταῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of the LXX does not give the exact meaning of אם־חרוצים ימיו, and points to a different text.

Num XII.7 The LXX is a faithful rendering of the Heb.

Job I.1 A detailed comparison of Cl and the LXX is impossible in this case. All the words except δέ and κακαῦ of Cl are found in the LXX passage of Job. Knopf thinks that Cl is quoting from memory, despite the introductory words, περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτως γέγραπται.

Job XIV.4,5a A detailed comparison of Cl and LXX is impossible. Cl is probably quoting from memory. He seems to be following LXX-A.

Num XII.7 The word μου of the LXX refers to God in 1

Ex III.11	Cl XVII.5
Τίς εἰμι, ὅτι πορεύσομαι πρὸς φαραω βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ὅτι ἐξάξω τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραηλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου;	Τίς εἰμι ἐγώ, ὅτι με πέμπεις; Ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος.
Ex III.11	Ex IV.10
מי אנכי כי אלך אל־פרעה וכי אוציא את־בני ישראל ממצרים	ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγώ εἰμι.
Ex IV.10 כבד־פה וכבד לשון אנכי	

τίς εἰμι LXX-A*F*M, + ἐγώ Sw BMT c. LXX-B: + ἐγώ Cl c. LXX-B.

LXX adds βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου after φαραω. The same addition is made also in the preceding verse.

---

per., but in Cl God is spoken of in 3 per., therefore it is natural that μου is changed to αὐτοῦ. However, it is apparent that Cl is closer to the passage of Heb III.2. This loose quotation of Num XII.7 has no formula citandi.

Ex III.11(Cl XVII.5) A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX is out of the question in this case. Instead of πορεύσομαι κ.τ.λ., Cl has a simpler expression, με πέμπεις. He may have gotten the idea of "sending" from ἀποστείλω σε of Ex III.10. The latter part of the quotation is taken from Ex IV.10, changing the word order and adding δέ to suit his context. Cl follows LXX-B in this passage. It has no formula citandi.

I Ch XXIX.15(Syriac)? Cl XVII.6

ܠܬܢܢܐ ܕܩܕܪܐ ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ κύθρας.

As to this quotation, GH merely repeats the supposition of Hilgenfeld that the words were taken from the *Assumption of Moses*. Li confesses that "this quotation is not found in the Old Testament or in any apocryphal book extant whole or in part."[20] La has no suggestion to make.

J. R. Harris, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 29, pp. 190-195, suggests that this quotation is from the Syriac version of I Ch. XXIX.15. According to him, the prayer of David, in Ch XXIX, "We are strangers before thee, and sojourners, as all our fathers were. And our days upon earth are a shadow, and there is none abiding," is rendered in the Syriac version as follows: "And we are comparable *to the smoke of a pot*, and we sojourn with thee and are of small account in the world, and thou didst rule over our fathers aforetime."

Ingenious as it is, his proposition leaves unsolved the following difficulties: (1) How can a Greek ancestry be found for the peculiar Syriac version, (2) how can Cl, quoting the supposed Greek Ch, have made the misplacement in question.

Ps LXXXVIII.21	Cl XVIII.1
εὗρον Δαυειδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου, ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ μου ἔχρισα αὐτόν.	εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν.
I Sam XIII.14b	Acts XIII.22
καὶ ζητήσει κύριος ἑαυτῳ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.	εὗρον Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου.

Ps LXXXIX.21 מצאתי דוד עבדי בשמן קדשי משחתיו

I Sam XIII.14b בקש יהוה לו איש כלבבו

ἐλαίῳ Ra c. LXX-B^{b}AST, ἐλέει Sw c. LXX-B: ἐλέει Cl-AC (ἐλεῖε Cl-A), ἐλαίῳ Cl-S ClAlex / ἁγίῳ: αἰωνίῳ Cl

----

Ps faithful to MT / I Sam LXX adds καὶ before ζητήσει to smooth out the connection with the preceding clause.

ἁγίῳ] It is probable that Cl has borrowed this expression from Is LIV.8, where we find the words, ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἐλεήσω (ἠλέησά LXX-AQ*) σε.

For ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, cf. Acts XIII.22 and I Sam XIII.14b; for Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, cf. Acts XIII.22, II Sam XXIII.1 (πιστὸς Δαυεὶδ υἱὸς Ἰεσσαί), and Ps LXXI.20. The close resemblance of the first part of Cl's quotation and that of Acts XIII.22 is very striking. Whether Co was influenced by the reading of Acts, or they had a common text which was different from our LXX text, it is difficult to say. This quotation is preceded by the words, εἶπεν ὁ θεός.

Ps L.3-19 quoted in Cl XVIII.2-17

3 Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ θεός, κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεος σου καὶ κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου ἐξάλειψον τὸ ἀνόμημά μου· 4 ἐπὶ πλεῖον πλῦνόν με ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας μου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου καθάρισόν με. 5 ὅτι τὴν ἀνομίαν μου ἐγὼ γινώσκω, καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία μου ἐνώπιον μου ἐστιν διὰ παντός. 6 σοὶ μόνῳ ἥμαρτον καὶ τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιόν σου ἐποίησα, ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν ταῖς λόγοις σου, καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. 7 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήμφθην, καὶ ἐν ἡμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέν με ἡ μήτηρ μου. 8 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀλήθειαν ἠγάπησας, τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῆς σοφίας σου ἐδήλωσάς μοι. 9 ῥαντιεῖς

Ps LI.3-19 [3]חנני אלהים כחסדך כרם רחמיך מחה פשעי [4]הרבה
כבסני מעוני ומחטאתי טהרני [5]כי־פשעי אני אדע וחטאתי
נגדי תמיד [6]לך לבדך חטאתי והרע בעיניך עשיתי למען תצדק
בדברך תזכה בשפטך [7]הן־בעוון חוללתי ובחטא יחמתני אמי
[8]הן־אמת חפצת בטחות ובסתם חכמה תודיעני [9]תחטאני באזוב

---

3 LXX adds μέγα before ἔλεος. Is this due to the difficulty of translating the Heb. word חסד? But in Ps CXLIV.2, LIX.18, XXI.8, XXXI.17,22, XXXII.10, etc., the word is rendered simply ἔλεος. μέγα is added probably to counterbalance τὸ πλῆθος / פשעי τὸ ἀνόμημα / 5 פשעי τὴν ἀνομίαν / 6 תצדק δικαιωθῇς The meaning is the same / בדברך ἐν ταῖς λόγοις σου probably reading בדבריך, which might have been a correct reading / תזכה בשפטך νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε Briggs prefers the Heb. reading, saying, " . . . . as if the poet thought of a higher judgment seat before which God Himself could be tried, a conceit which,however suited to Greek and modern ideas, was not suited to the religion of the Old Testament."[21] / 7 LXX adds γάρ after ἰδού / בעוון ἐν ἀνομίαις / חוללתי συνελήμφθην / בחטא ἐν ἁμαρτίαις / יחמתני ἐκίσσησέν με These changes improves the logical order / 8 LXX adds γάρ after ἰδού to smooth out the connection /

* * *

Cl-C contains only Ἐλέησόν με . . . . τὸ ἀνόμημά μου, and omits the rest of quotation, which is very characteristic

με ὑσσώπῳ, καὶ καθαρισθήσομαι· πλυνεῖς με, καὶ ὑπὲρ χιόνα λευκανθήσομαι. 10 ἀκουτιεῖς με ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ εὐφροσύνην. ἀγαλλιάσονται ὀστα τεταπεινωμένα. 11 ἀπόστρεψόν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας μου ἐξάλειψον. 12 καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοί, ὁ θεός, καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθες ἐγκαίνισον ἐν ταῖς ἐγκάτοις μου. 13 μὴ ἀπορρίψῃς με ἀπὸ ταῦ προσώμου σου, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σου μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀπ' ἐμαῦ. 14 ἀπόδος μαι τὴν ἀγαλλίασιν ταῦ σωτηρίου σου, καὶ πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ στήρισόν με. 15 διδάξω

ואטהר תכבסני ומשלג אלבין [10]תשמיעני ששון ושמחה תגלנה
עצמות דכית [11]הסתר פניך מחטאי וכל-עונתי מחה [12]לב טהור ברא-לי
אלהים ורוח נכון חדש בקרבי [13]אל-תשליכני מלפניך ורוח קדשך
אל-תקח ממני [14]השיבה לי ששון ישעך ורוח נדיבה תסמכני

---

13 ἀγκαίνισον, ἐνκάτοις LXX-RT: = Cl, ἀνκάτοις Cl-A /

LXX reads τὰ ἄδηλα for במחות and appears to destroy the parallelism of the verse by joining it to the second half / בסתם τὰ κρύφια As to the omission of ב, Hatch thinks it "conceivable that the original LXX version may have been εἰς τὰ ἄδηλα, and that it was misunderstood and altered by a scribe."[22] / LXX adds σου after σοφίας, specifying it /

---

of C. The text of Cl follows LXX-B throughout against LXX-SRT. The quotation is introduced by the words, καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

The omission of Ps L.20-21 from the text of Cl is conspicuous. Two explanations are conceivable: (1) Cl might have excluded the last two verses of the passage on account of their ideas, which might have appeared to be contradictory to his. These two verses are diametrically opposed to the lofty idea of the two preceding verses, 18 and 19.

ἀνόμους τὰς ὁδούς σου, καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἐπὶ σὲ ἐπιστρέψουσιν. 16 ῥῦσαί με ἐξ αἱμάτων, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεὸς τῆς σωτηρίας μου· ἀγαλλιάσεται ἡ γλῶσσάμου τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου. 17 κύριε, τὰ χείλη μου ἀνοίξεις, καὶ τὸ στόμα μου ἀναγγελεῖ τὴν αἴνεσίν σου. 18 ὅτι εἰ ἠθέλησας θυσίαν, ἔδωκα ἄν· ὁλοκαυτώματα οὐκ εὐδοκήσεις. 19 θυσία τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον, καρδίαν συντετριμμένην καὶ τεταπεινωμένην ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐξουθενώσει.

[15]אלמדה פשעים דרכיך וחטאים אליך ישובו [16]הצילני מדמים אלהים
אלהי תשועתי תרנן לשוני צדקתך [17]אדני שפתי תפתח ופי יגיד
[18]כי לא־תחפץ זבח ואתנה עולה לא תרצה [19]זבחי אלהים רוח
נשברה לב־נשבר ונדכה אלהים לא תבזה׃

---

15 ἐπὶ σὲ ἐπιστρέψουσιν: ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ σέ / 17 τὰ χείλη . . . τὸ στόμα: tr. Cl(= Cl-S c. LXX MT) / ἐξουθενώσει, -δενωσει LXX-SRT: = Cl.

---

14 נדיבה ἡγεμονικῷ Reason unknown / 18 לא־תחפץ . . עולה LXX renders a little differently, but the meaning is essentially the same. εἰ ἠθέλησας θυσίαν ἔδωκα ἄν. / עילה ὁλοκαυτώματα.

This supposition is favored by the fact that Cl quotes Ps L. 19 again in LII.3, but without verses 20 and 21. On the other hand, we find out from his inclusion in XXXV.12 of Ps XLIX.23, which is very much like Ps L.20,21 in substance, that Cl is not at all opposed to the idea of sacrifice. (2) The second possible explanation is that Cl's text of the LXX did not possess these verses. The secondary character of these verses has long been recognized by many Old Testament scholars. For instance, Kirkpatrick writes, "These verses are not part of the original Psalm, but an addition by the exiles who adapted it to their own needs."[23] T.K.Cheyne also classifies them

Gen I.9 quoted in Cl XX.6

εἰς τὰς συναγωγάς

Job XXXVIII.11	Cl XX.7
μέχρι τούτου ἐλεύσῃ καὶ οὐχ	ἕως ὧδε ἥξεις, καὶ τὰ
ὑπερβήσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν σεαυτῇ	κύματά σου ἐν σοὶ συν-
συντριβήσεται σου τὰ κύματα.	τριβήσεται.

עד־פה תבוא ולא תסיף ופא ישית בגאון גליך

Job XXXVIII.11 μέχρι τούτου ἐλεύσῃ: ἕως ὧδε ἥξεις Cl.

Job XXXVIII.11 LXX reads οὐχ ὑπερβήσῃ for לא תסיף / The words ἀλλ' ἐν σεαυτῇ συντριβήσεταί σου τὰ κύματα, do not represent the Heb. These variants point to a different text.

as an appendix.[24] Therefore it is a legitimate inference that these verses may have been missing in the text of the LXX used by Cl.

Gen I.9 The sentence from which this quotation is taken συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὤφθη ἡ ξηρά is wanting in the Hebrew. Kn and GH do not indicate these words as a quotation, but credit as an allusion. La ignores it altogether.

Job XXXVIII.11 Cl follows to some extent the LXX in the last part of the quotation, although the order of words is a little different. Cl reads ἐν σοι for ἐν σεαυτῇ, probably owing to his softening of the Yahweh's austere command. The omission of καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήσῃ, and the substitution of ἀλλ' by καὶ may be thus explained. The substitution of ἕως ὧδε

Prov XX.27	Cl XXI.2
φῶς κυρίου πνοὴ ἀνθρώπων, ὃς ἐρευνᾷ ταμίεια κοιλίας.	πνεῦμα κυρίου λύχνος ἐρευνῶν τὰ ταμιεῖα τῆς γαστρός.

נר יהוה נשמת אדם חפש כל־חדרי־בטן

φῶς κυρίου πνοὴ ἀνθρώπων: πνεῦμα κυρίου λύχνος Cl.

The LXX is a literal translation of the Heb., "The spirit of man[LXX men] is the lamp of Yahweh[LXX the Lord]."

ἥξεις for μέχρι τούτου ἐλεύσῃ is difficult to account for. Cl uses the word μέχρι in IV.9(μέχρι θανάτου), showing that he does not necessarily prefer the word ἕως. A hypothesis that his LXX text of Job was somewhat different from ours is not well grounded, for he quotes exactly from Job in Cl XXXIX.3-9, LVI.6-15. The best explanation of this loose quotation may be that Cl here is quoting from memory, as he seems to do so many times. The quotation is introduced by εἶπεν γάρ.

Prov XX.27 Cl changes not only the expression of the LXX but also its idea to suit his context. LXX-A adds ἡ λύχνος after ἀνθρώπων. Li thinks that "this must originally have been a gloss suggesting al alternative reading for φῶς, as λύχνος is actually read by Aq. Sym. Theod."[25] Perhaps λύχνος came to be interpolated here from Prov VI.23, λύχνος ἐντολὴ νόμου καὶ φῶς.

ὃς ἐρευνᾷ] The Hebrew word חפש(part.) is rendered ἐρευνᾷ(pres.) in the LXX, but ἐρευνῶν(part.) in Cl. The agreement of Cl with the MT against the LXX is too slight to

κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους, καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν. 17 πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακὰ τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἐκ γῆς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν. 18 ἐκέκραξαν οἱ δίκαιοι, καὶ ὁ κύριος εἰσήκουσεν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτῶν ἐρρύσατο αὐτούς. Ps XXXIII.20 πολλαὶ αἱ θλίψεις τῶν δικαίων, καὶ ἐκ πασῶν αὐτῶν ῥύσεται αὐτούς. Ps XXXI.10 πολλαὶ αἱ μάστιγες τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, τὸν δὲ ἐλπίζοντα ἐπὶ κύριον ἔλεος κυκλώσει.

יהוה אל-צדיקים ואזניו אל-שועתם [17]פני יהוה בעשי רע להכרית
מארץ זכרם [18]צעקו ויהוה שמע ומכל-צרותם הצילם
Ps XXXIV.20 רבות רעות צדיק ומכלם יצילנו יהוה
Ps XXXII.10 רבים מכאובים לרשע והבוטח ביהוה חסד יסובבנו

---

17 ἐξολεθρεῦσαι, -λοθρευσαι LXX-AR, -λευθρεῦσαι LXX-U: = Cl / γῆς, pr. τῆς LXX-U: = Cl / 18 ἐκέραξαν οἱ δίκαιοι, δίκαιοι ἐκέκρ.(om. οἱ) LXX-7: ἐκέκραξεν ὁ δίκαιος Cl Li says, "In the existing text of Cl Alex this is read ἐκέραξεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος καὶ εἰσήκουσε, obviously a corruption."[26] / ἐρρύσατο Ra c. LXX-SAR, ἐρύσατο Sw c. LXX-B, ἔσωσεν LXX-U: ἐρύσατο Cl / αὐτούς: αὐτόν Cl / 20 τῶν δικαίων: τοῦ δικαίου Cl MT Pes / αὐτούς, + ὁ θύριος LXX-AU: αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος Cl MT / XXXI.10 τὸν δὲ ἐλπίζοντα: τοὺς δὲ ἐλπίζοντας Cl / In v.20 Cl agrees with MT in reading the nouns and pronouns in sing., and also in adding ὁ κύριος. This singular form of v.20 may have caused the change of the number of the nouns and pronouns of v.18.

---

after πρόσωπον / 18 LXX adds οἱ δίκαιοι, which is understood in the Heb. / LXX adds αὐτῶν after εἰσήκουσεν, implied in the Heb. / 20 צדיק τῶν δικαίων / יהוה omitted. These are very unimportant differences.

In his opinion, Cl-A omits this sentence probably owing to the recurrence of πολλαὶ αἱ. On the other hand, La, who omits it, says, "The evidence of ACLK suggests that it is an insertion from the text of the LXX."[27] It is difficult to

Is XIII.22	Cl XXIII.5
ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ	ταχὺ ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ καὶ
Mal III.1b,c	ἐξαίφνης ἥξει ὁ κύριος εἰς
καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἥξει εἰς τὸν	τὸν ναὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ ἅγιος,
ναὸν ἑαυταῦ κύριος, ὃν ὑμεῖς	ὃν ὑμεῖς προσδοκᾶτε.
ζητεῖτε, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς	
διαθήκης, ὃν ὑμεῖς θέλετε·	Is XIII.22 וקרוב לבוא
ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται, λέγει κύριος	עתה וימיה לא ימשכו
παντοκράτωρ.	

Mal III.1b,c ופתאם יבוא אל־היכלו האדון אשר־אתם מבקשים
ומלאך הברית אשר אתם חפצים הנה־בא אמר יהוה צבאות

---

22 ἔρχεται: ἥξει Cl / εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυταῦ (LXX-BS, αὐτοῦ LXX-A, om. LXX-QW c. MT) Κύριος: ὁ κύριος εἰς τὸν ναὸν αὐταῦ Cl / ὃν ὑμεῖς ζητεῖτε: - Cl / ὁ ἄγγελος τῆσ διαθήκης, ὃν ὑμεῖς θέλετε: ὁ ἅγιος, ὃν ὑμεῖς προσδοκατε Cl.

Is XIII.22 ו omitted in the LXX / קרוב ταχύ / לבוא ἔρχεται / עתה omitted in the LXX / ימיה om. / ימשכו χρονιεῖ due to the elimination of עאה / Mal III.1b מבקשים ζητεῖτε / 1c חפצים θέλετε.

---

decide on this matter, but Li's argument seems to appeal to our reason better. Moreover Li adds the word εἶτα between ὁ κύριος and the second πολλαί αἱ. This reading is supported by C and probably S(S reads *et iterum* = καὶ πάλιν?), but is not considered by Li as part of the quotation.

Throughout the quotation Cl appears to follow a text represented by LXX-A against LXX-BS. The formula citandi is οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς.

Is XIII.22 f. 22 ἔρχεται] Cl's reading my have been suggested by ἥξει of Mal III.1, which follows.

Ps LXX.21c,22a	Cl XXVI.2
καὶ [ἐκ τῶν ἀβύσσων τῆς τῆς πάλιν] ἀνήγαγές με. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι.	καὶ ἐξαναστήσεις με, καὶ ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι.
Ps XXVII.7	
καὶ ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σάρξ μου· καὶ ἐκ θελήματός μου ἐξομολογήσομαι αὐτῷ.	

Ps LXXI.20c ומתהומות הארץ תשוב תעלני Ps LXXI.22a גם־אני אודך
Ps XXVIII.7 ויעלז לבי ומשירי אהודנו

ἀνήγαγες: ἐξαναστήσεις Cl / γάρ: - Cl / ἐγώ Ra c. LXX-B$^{a.b.}$SR, om. Sw c. LXX-B: om. Cl.

ויעלז καὶ ἀνέθαλεν This change is probably due to the change of לבי into ἡ σάρξ μου / ומשירי ἐκ θελήματός μου These changes cannot be satisfactorily accounted for; they may point to the existence of a different Heb. text / Ps LXXI.22a γάρ is added for smooth connection.

Is XIII.22 ὁ ἄγγελος κ.τ.λ.] Li thinks that this substitution may have been intentional, but is much more probably an inadvertence of Cl, who quotes from memory largely but loosely. The quotation is introduced by the words, συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς.

Ps LXX.21c f. ἀνήγαγες] Cl changes the tense of the verb to suit his context. The two words are the same in meaning.

This quotation has been generally held to be a loose citation of Ps XXVII.7. But Bauer suggests that it is taken probably from Ps LXX.21 f., and this is much better than any other former suggestions given by GH, Kn, Li, and La. In

Ps III.6	Cl XXVI.2
ἐγὼ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὕπνωσα· ἐξηγέρθην, ὅτι κύριος ἀντιλήμψεταί μου.	[καὶ] ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὕπνωσα, ἐξηγέρθην, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμαῦ εἶ.
Ps XXII.4	
οὐ φοβήσομαι κακὰ ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμαῦ εἶ.	

Ps III.6 אני שכבתי ואישנה הקיצותי כי יהוה יסמכנ
Ps XXIII.4 לא־אירש רע כי־אתה עמדי

Ps III.6 ἐγώ: om. Cl.

The LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb.

---

fact, there is no correspondence between Cl and Ps XXVII.7 other than the conjunction καὶ and the word ἐξομολογήσομαι, while Ps LXX.21 f. shows a better parallel.[28]

Sw has Ps LXX.21c with LXX-B, but S omits it with the MT, and Ra has it in brackets. The question is whether or not Cl is quoting v.21c, which is an exact replica of v.20c. If he had followed a text represented by LXX-S, his quotation was taken from v.20c + v.22a, but, on the other hand, if he had followed another text represented by LXX-B, then it was taken from v.21c + v.22a. The second hypothesis is more acceptable than the first. In other words, Cl here agrees with B against S and MT. The quotation is introduced by the words λέγει γάρ που.

Ps III.6 f. Although Li inserts καὶ before ἐκοιμήθην and makes this a continuation of the preceding quotation, it seems better without it, for neither the MT nor the LXX has it. GH, Kn, and La exclude the word. This quotation is evidently a confusion of two Pss, the first part taken from

Job XIX.26	Cl XXVI.3
ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀνατλῶν ταῦτα· παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη.	καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην τὴν ἀναντλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα.

Job XIX.26 ואחר עורי נקפו-זאת ומבשרי אחזה אלוה

Wis XII.12	Cl XXVII.5
Τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ Τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου;	Τίς ἐπεῖ αὐτῷ· Τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ;

Wis XII.12 γάρ: om.Cl / ἐρεῖ: + αὐτῷ Cl / κρίματι: κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος Cl.

Job XIX.26 The LXX is entirely different from the Heb. and a detailed comparison is impossible. The difficult sentence, ומבשרי אחזה אלוה, is rendered παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη. The Heb. may mean "without my flesh (i.e. after death) shall I see God," or, as Smith's American Translation has it, "And after my skin has been torn off,-- like this! -- and from my flesh, I shall see God." The latter translation is better suited to the context. And yet the LXX gives an entirely different meaning to it, reading ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀνατλῶν ταῦτα.

Ps II.6 and the second from XXII.4. It has no formula citandi.

Job XIX.16 Cl improves this still further by changing δέρμα to σάρκα and ἀνατλῶν to ἀναντλήσασαν, thus referring to the resurrection of the flesh, which fits his argument better. A detailed comparison of Cl and the LXX is difficult in this case. The quotation is introduced by the formula, πάλιν Ἰὼβ λέγει.

Wis XII.12 ἐπεῖ] Cl adds αὐτῷ to suit his context, where he is speaking of the majesty of God.

Pacific School of Religion

Ps XVIII.2-4 quoted in Cl XXVII.7

2 αἱ οὐρανοὶ διηγοῦνται δόξαν θεοῦ, ποίησιν δὲ χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀναγγέλλει τὸ στερέωμα· 3 ἡμέρα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐρεύγεται ῥῆμα, καὶ νὺξ νυκτὶ ἀναγγέλλει γνῶσιν. 4 οὐκ εἰσὶν λαλιαὶ οὐδὲ λόγοι, ὧν οὐχὶ ἀκούονται αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν.

Ps XIX.2-4 [2]השמים מספרים כבוד־אל ומעשה ידיו מגיד הרקיע
[3]יום ליום יביע אמר ולילה ללילה יהוה־דעת [4]אין־אמר ואין דברים
בלי נשמע קולם

----

2 ποίησιν, pr. καί LXX-U: = Cl / τὸ στερέωμα, τῷ στερ. LXX-U: = Cl / 3 ἡμέρα, pr. ἡ LXX-SA: pr. ἡ Cl c. LXX-SA / 4 οὐκ: pro. καί Cl / λαλιαὶ . . . . λόγοι: tr. Cl(= Cl-SC LXX) / αὐτῶν, om. LXX-A: = Cl.

----

2 מספרים διηγοῦνται / ו is rendered δέ / מגיד ἀναγγέλλει / 3 יביע ἐρεύγεται / יחוה ἀναγγέλει / 4 אמר λαλιαί LXX adds ὧν before οὐχί and αἱ before φωναί. These differences are natural for a translation.

Wis XII.12 κρίματι] The word κράτει may have been suggested by Wis XI.21, where the expression, κράτει βραχίονος σου τίς ἀντιστήσεται, occurs. For ἰσχύος, cf. Eph I.19 and VI.10, τὸ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. This quotation without a formula citandi is probably a confusion of Wis XII.12 and XI.21.

Ps XVIII.2-4 3 ἡμέρα] Cl follows a text represented by LXX-SA. If not, the article here was probably suggested by τῇ ἡμερᾳ.

4 λαλιαὶ . . . . λόγοι] This appears to be a transcriptional error.

In Cl-C the sentence beginning with ἡ ἡμερα runs καὶ ἀκούονται αἱ φωναί παντῶν βλεπομένων καὶ ἀκουομένων· φοβη-

Ps CXXXVIII.7-10	Cl XXVIII.3
7 παῦ πορευθῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός σου καὶ ἀπὸ ταῦ προσώπου σου παῦ φύγω; 8 ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, σὺ εἶ ἐκεῖ· ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ᾄδην, πάρει· 9 ἐὰν ἀναλάβοιμι τὰς πτέρυγάς μου κατ' ὄρθρον καὶ κατασκηνώσω εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς θαλάσσης, 10 καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἡ χείρ σου ὁδηγήσει με, καὶ καθέξει με ἡ δεξιά σου.	παῦ ἀφήξω καὶ παῦ κρυβήσομαι ἀπὸ ταῦ προσώπου σου; ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, σὺ ἐκεῖ εἶ· ἐὰν ἀπέλθω εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς γῆς, ἐκεῖ ἡ δεξιά σου· ἐὰν καταστρώσω εἰς τὰς ἀβύσσους, ἐκεῖ τὸ πνεῦμά σου.

Ps CXXXIX.7-10 [7]אנה אלך מרוחך ואנה מפניך אברח [8]אם־אסק שמים
שם אתה ואציעה שאול הנך [9]אשא כנפי־שחר אשכנה באחרית ים [10]גם־שם
ידך תנחני ותאחזני ימינך:

---

8 שמים τὸν οὐρανόν / LXX adds εἰς before τὸν οὐρανόν / LXX adds εἶ before ἐκεῖ / ו is omitted and ἐάν is added instead / אציעה is rendered καταβῶ, and εἰς is added after it / הנך is rendered πάρει / 9 ἐάν is added before ἀναλάβοιμι and μου after πτέρυγας / The figurative speech, כנפי־שחר, is rendered literally τὰς πτέρυγάς μου κατ' ὄρθρον / καί is added before κατασκηνώσω / 10 γάρ is added before ἐκεῖ / תנחני ὁδηγήσει. These variants are mostly translation variants.

θῶμεν κ.τ.λ., omitting many words. The omissions here are not explained satisfactorily by C's practice of abridging quotations. Cl's quotation has no formula citandi.

Ps CXXXVIII.7-10 A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX is impossible in this case, where Cl is evidently quoting from memory. The words, ἀπὸ ταῦ προσώπου . . . . ἐκεῖ εἶ, are found in the LXX, vv.7 and 8. 8 εἶ ἐκεῖ B, tr. Li Kn c. Cl-A LXX-BAS / καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ᾄδην: κατα-

στρώσω εἰς τὰς ἀβύσσους Cl, καταβῶ εἰς ἀβ. ClAlex *Strom.*IV. 22. Kn suggests that καταστρώσω may go back to the Heb. אציעה. This suggestion is illuminating, because the Heb. word is better translated by καταστρώσω than by καταβῶ. Li also recognizes this fact, but he says further, "This is the more remarkable, as he elsewhere shows no knowledge of the Hebrew, and in the Psalms generally quotes pretty accurately from the LXX. Whence then did he get this word? We may conjecture that he was acquainted with one of the versions afterwards included by Origen in his Hexapla. The 5th version (ε in Origen) has στρώσω or καταστρώσω . . . . and as this seems to have been the one found in an old cask either at Jericho or Nicopolis . . . . it may very well have been an ancient Jewish tradition prior to the age of Clement."[29]

ClAlex *Strom.*IV.22 quotes the passage nearly in the form which Cl has here. Though he tends to go back to the LXX now and then, he doubtlessly derived it through the medium of Cl, so that he is not an independent authority. Cl may have averted the idea of Hades, for he reads τὰς ἀβύσσους for τὸν ᾅδην. Cl's quotation has the significant formula, λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖαν. The Heb. כתובים is translated sometimes γραφεῖᾳ, sometimes ἁγιόγραφα. In writing τὸ γραφεῖον, Cl seems to adopt the threefold division of the Old Testament books.

Deut XXXII.8,9 quoted in Cl XXIX.2

8 ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔφνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεαῦ, 9 καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐταῦ Ἰακώβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐταῦ Ἰσραήλ.

[8]בהנחל אליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבלת עמים למספר
בני ישראל [9]כי חלק יהוה עמו יעקב חבל נחלתו

Deut IV.34	Cl XXIX.3
εἰ ἐπείρασεν ὁ θεὸς εἰσελθὼν	ἰδοῦ, κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ
λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου	ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν, ὥσπερ
ἔθνους.	λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν
Deut XIV.2	αὐταῦ τῆς ἅλω· καὶ ἐξελεύσεται
καὶ σὲ ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ	ἐκ ταῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια
θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ	ἁγίων.
λαὸν περιούσιον ἀπὸ πάντων	II Ch XXXI.14
τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐπὶ προσώπου	καὶ Κωρη ὁ ταῦ Ιεμνα ὁ
τῆς γῆς.	Λευίτης ὁ πυλωρὸς κατὰ ἀνα-

Deut XXXII.8,9 9 καί: om.Cl.

Deut XXXII.8,9 8 הנחל is rendered διεμέριζεν / אדם is taken as a proper noun, Αδαμ / בני ישראל is rendered ἀγγέλων θεαῦ / 9 כי is rendered καί / LXX adds ἐγενήθη before μερίς(probably implied in the Heb.), and Ιακωβ is connected to λαὸς αὐταῦ. It also adds Ισραηλ after κληρονομίας αὐταῦ, perhaps for the sake of prallelism. This "may be an anticipation of the later doctrine of guardian-angels, presiding over the different nations, found in Dan. 10:13,20, 21; 12:1, Sir.17:17, and frequently alluded to in post-Biblical Jewish literature."[80]

Deut XXXII.8,9 The quotation is introduced by the words, οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται.

Deut IV.34 etc. A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX is out of the question. The source of this quotation

Num XVIII.27
καὶ λογισθήσεται ὑμῖν τὰ ἀφαιρέματα ὑμῶν ὡς σῖτος ἀπὸ ἅλω καὶ ἀφαιρέμα ἀπὸ ληναῦ.

τολὰς ἐπὶ τῶν δομάτων δαῦναι τὰς ἀπαρχὰς κυρίῳ καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων.

Ez XLVIII.12
καὶ ἔσται αὐταῖς ἡ ἀπαρχὴ δεδομένη ἐκ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν τῆς γῆς, ἅγιον ἁγίων ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων τῶν Λευιτῶν.

Deut IV.34 או הנסה אלהים לבוא לקחת לו גוי מקרב גוי
Deut XIV.2 ובך בחר יהוה להיות לו לעם סגלה
מכל העמים אשר על־פני האדמה
Num XVIII.27 ונחשב לכם תרומתכם כדגן מן־הגרן וכמלאה מן־היקב
II Ch XXXI.14 וקורא בן־ימנה הלוי השוער למזרחה על
נדבות האלהים לתת תרומת יהוה וקדשי הקדשים
Ez XLVIII.12 והיתה להם תרומיה מתרומת הארץ קדש קדשים
אל־גבול הלוים

Prov III.34 quoted in Cl XXX.2

κύριος ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.

אם־ללצים הוא־יליץ ולעניים יתן־חן

Prov III.34 κύριος: θεός Cl, ὁ θεός I Pet V.5, Jam IV. 6, הוא MT.

ללצים ὑπερηθάνοις / הוא is rendered κύριος probably

---

is not clear. The passages quoted here in the parallel column are those which most nearly resemble this quotation, but the difference is considerable. The passage which most nearly parallels the beginning of the quotation is Deut IV. 34. ὥσπελ λαμβάνει κ.τ.λ. may have been taken from Num XVIII.27, II Ch XXXI.14, and Ez XLVIII.12, but the similarity is almost negligible. The formula of citation, ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ

Job XI.2,3 quoted in Cl XXX.4,5

2 ὁ τὰ πολλὰ λέγων καὶ ἀντακούσεται· 3 ἢ καὶ ὁ εὔλαλος οἴεται εἶναι δίκαιος; εὐλογημένος γεννητὸς γυναικὸς

---

to make a better parallelism with θεοῦ of v.33 / ילין ἀντιτάσσεται. These minor changes are due to the effort of the translator to give a better antithesis. Toy is true when he says that the translator "sometimes departs from the literal rendering in order to give the translation a smoother and more idiomatic Greek form, sometimes also in order to obtain a better antithesis or a more appropriate thought."[31]

Job XI.2,3 2 יצדק . . . . הרב is rendered differently and it is impossible to compare them in detail, but the meaning in the both texts are the same. The LXX inserts

---

λέγει, may refer to a lost apocryphon. But probably it is a mixture of passages quoting from memory.

Prov III.34 κύριος] Cl substitutes θεός for κύριος to suit his context, or he may be following either I Peter or James which quote this passage. All the editors of Cl take γάρ as a part of the quotation, but there is no reason why we should do so. This quotation is introduced by the words γὰρ φησίν.

Job XI.2,3 3 καί] By omitting this conjunction, Cl improves the Greek of the LXX.

γεννητὸς γυναικός] Cl follows a text represented by LXX-BSC against LXX-A. That Cl is quoting from the LXX is definitely proved by the inclusion in his quotation the meaningless words, εὐλογημένος γεννητὸς . . ὀλιγόβιος.

ὀλιγόγιος. μὴ πολὺς ἐν ῥήμασιν γίνου.

[2]הרב דברים לא יענה ואם־איש שפתים יצדק [3]בדיך מתים יחרישו

Gen XV.5	Cl XXXII.2
᾽Ανάβλεψον δὴ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς. καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου.	ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς αἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
Gen XXVI.4	Gen XXII.17
πληθύνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς	πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ

Job XI.2,3 3 καί: - Cl / εἶναι δίκαιος LXX-BSC, tr. LXX-A: = Cl c. LXX-BSC / γεννητὸς γυναικός LXX-BSC, tr. LXX-A: = Cl c. LXX-BSC.

εὐλογημένος . . . . ὀλιγόβιος after δίκαιος / 3 . . בדיך יחרישו is rendered μὴ πολὺς . . . . γίνου. Concerning these changes the words of Driver and Gray should be noted, "The version is often free and paraphrastic."[32]

Li conjectures that "the words γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ὀλιγόβιος crept in from XIV.1 βροτὸς γὰρ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ὀλιγόβιος, which may have stood next to this passage in a parallel column, and the εὐλογημένος will have come from the first word of the next verse, בדיך misread ברוך."[33] The quotation has the formula, λέγει γάρ.

Gen XV.5 etc. A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX is impossible. The words, ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου, are found in Gen XV.5, and the rest in both Gen XXII.17 and XXVI.4 (τοὺς ἀστέρας). Cl resembles Gen XXVI.4 best. Though the formula, ὡς ἐπαγγειλαμένου τοῦ θεοῦ, procedes the quota-

ἀστέρας ταῦ οὐραναῦ.	σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας ταῦ οὐραναῦ.

Gen XV.5 הבט־נא השמימה וספר הכוכבים אם־תוכל
לספר אתם ויאמר לו כה יהיה זרעך
Gen XXII.17 והרבה ארבה את־זרעך ככוכבי השמים
Gen XXVI.4 והרביאי את־זרעך ככוכבי השמים

Gen I.26, 27	Cl XXXIII.5
26ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. . 27 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεαῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.	ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν· καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

[26]נעצה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו. [27]ויברא אלהים את־האדם בצלמו

Gen I.28 quoted in Cl XXXIII.6

αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε. פרו ורבו

Gen XV.5 etc. The LXX is faithful to the Hebrew, except the omission of καί at the beginning of the passage.

Gen I.26, 27 26 εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν: om. ἡμετέραν Cl / ὁμοίωσιν: + ἡμετέραν Cl / 27 κατ' εἰκόνα . . . . αὐτόν: om. Cl / 26 LXX inserts καί before καθ' ὁμοίωσιν.

----

tion, Cl's citation is free.

Gen I.26, 27 This is obviously taken from Gen I.26, 27. The quotation has the formula, οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ θεός.

Gen I.28 The quotation is introduced by the words, καὶ εἶπεν. It is taken from Gen I.28. Also cf. Gen I.22, VIII.17, and IX.1, 7.

Is XL.10	Cl XXXIV.3
ἰδοὺ κύριος μετὰ ἰσχύος ἔρχεται καὶ ὁ βραχίων μετὰ κυριείας, ἰδοὺ ὁ μισθὸς αὐταῦ μετ' αὐταῦ καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐναντίον αὐταῦ.	ἰδοὺ ὁ κύριος, καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐταῦ πρὸ προσώπου αὐταῦ, ἀποδαῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐταῦ.
Is LXII.11	Prov XXIV.12
ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἐποίησεν ἀκουστὸν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς Εἴπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιων Ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται ἔχων τὸν ἑαυταῦ μισθὸν καὶ τὸ ἔργον πρὸ προσώπου αὐταῦ.	ὅς ἀποδίδωσιν ἑκάστῳ κατα τὰ ἔργα αὐταῦ. Rev XXII.12 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ταχὺ καὶ ὁ μισθός μου μετ' ἐμαῦ ἀποδαῦναι ἑκάστῳ ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἔσται αὐταῦ.

Is XL.10 הנה אדני יהוה בחזק יבוא וזרעו משלה לו הנה שכרו אתו ופעלתו לפניו

Is XL.10 LXX om. יהוה / בחזק μετὰ ἰσχύος / משלה לו

The first part of Cl may be a confusion of Is XL.10 and Is LXII.11. Cl has a definite article before κύριος. This insertion is characteristic of Cl (ClAlex *Strom.*IV.22 has no article here). The latter part of Cl's quotation is found in Prov XXIV.12, although there are slight variations: ἀποδαῦναι for ἀποδίδωσιν and τὸ ἔργον αὐταῦ for τὰ ἔργα αὐταῦ.

This composite quotation of widely separated passages of the Old Testament may be due to the existence of a catena, or Cl is quoting from memory, confusing the similar passages, or, as Kn suggests, Cl is quoting from an apocryphon. Cl Alex's quotation of the same passage reads κύριος for ὁ

Is LXII.11 הנה יהוה השמיע אל־קצה הארץ אמרו לבת־ציון הנה
ישעך בא הנה שכרו אתו ופעלתו לפניו
Prov XXIV.12 והשיב לאדם כפעלו
Ps LXII.13 כי־אתה תשלם לאיש כמעשהו

Dan VII.10(θ) and Is VI.3 quoted in Cl XXXIV.6

Χίλιαι χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῳ, καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ. Is VI.3 καὶ ἐκέκραγον ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον καὶ ἔλεγον Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ, πλήφης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐταῦ.

μετὰ κυριείας / פעלתו τὸ ἔργον / Is LXII.11 LXX inserts γάρ after ἰδού / ישעך ὁ σωτὴρ / הנה 3° om. / אתו ἔχων / פעלתו τὸ ἔργον / לפניו πρὸ προσώπου αὐταῦ / Prov XXIV.12 ו om. / כפעלו τὰ ἔργα A free translation.

κύριος as stated above and ἀπὸ προσώπου for πρὸ προσώπου. The first change is in agreement with the LXX, and the second improves the Greek of both the LXX and Cl which retain Hebraism. However his passage is apparently taken from Cl, and does not cast light upon our problem. Cl's quotation is introduced by the formula, προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν.

Dan VII.10 χίλιαι κ.τ.λ.] Concerning this inverted order in Cl, Li says, "Iren. *Haer.*ii.7,4, Euseb.*Praep.Eu.* vii.15(p.326), Greg.Nyss.*Hom.viii in Eccles.*(I.p.463), Cyril.Hier.*Catech.*xv.24(p.237), and others, give the quotation with the inverted clauses as here; but, as it is quoted with every shade of variation in different fathers and even these same fathers in some cases give the right order elsewhere, no stress can be laid on this coincidence which seems to be purely accidental."[34] θ's order is the

Dan VII.10 אלף אלפים ישמשונה ורבו רבון קדמוהי יקומו,
Is VI.3 וקרא זה אל-זה ואמר קדוש קדוש קדוש יהוה צבאו.
מלא כל-הארץ כבודו

Dan VII.10 χίλιαι . . . . αὐτῷ μύριαι . . . . αὐτῷ: μύριαι . . . . αὐτῷ χίλιαι . . . . αὐτῷ Cl / ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ: = Cl Justin *Dial.* 31,2, ἐθεράπευον αὐτόν LXX MT / Is VI.3 ἐκέκραγον Ra c. LXX-ASQT, ἐκέκραγεν Sw c. LXX-B MT: = Cl / ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον καί: - Cl / γῆ LXX c. MT: κτίσις Cl-AS, γῆ Cl-C c. LXX.

---

same as the Aramaic and the LXX.

Is VI.3 ἕτερος πρὸς κ.τ.λ.] Cl omits these words, because the subject of ἐκέκραγον for him is not σεραφιν as in the LXX but μύριαι μυριάδες, and because they are not crying one to another but rather to God in one accord, cf. Cl V.7.

γῆ] Cl-C harmonizes with the LXX, and the reading of Cl-AS is better. Paul uses the word κτίσις very frequently, and it may be supposed that Cl was influenced by Paul's writings, or else he borrowed the word from Ps CIII.24 πληρώθη ἡ γῆ τῆς κτήσεώς (or κτίσεώς) σου.

Why does Cl make such a composite quotation of passages widely apart in nature? If they were somewhat similar in expression, we might suppose that they were strung together by Cl in his quotation from memory. But in this case where we do not find such similarity, we must explain it otherwise. Does this composite quotation refer to the existence of a book of Old Testament exerpts? We cannot answer definitely.

It is significant that Cl and Justin after him follow θ's reading of the passage in Dan. Since Justin quotes Dan

I Cor II.9	Cl XXXIV.8
ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.	ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν κύριος τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν.
Is LXIV.3	
ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεὸν πλὴν σοῦ καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.	ומעולם לא־שמעו לא האזינו עין לא־ראתה אלהים זולתך יעשה למחכה־לו

ἅ: - Cl / ὁ θεός I Cor II.9 ClAlex: κύριος Cl / ἀγαπῶσιν: ὑπομένουσιν Cl c. LXX.

ו om. / שמעו ἠκούσαμεν / לא האזינו om. / LXX adds ἡμῶν after ὀφθαλμοί / LXX adds καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου after πλὴν σοῦ / יעשה ἃ ποιήσεις / למחכה־לו τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον. Is LXIV(LXX) is a very free translation, and may prove the existence of a different original text than our MT. But these variations of the LXX do not have important bearing upon our study. The similarity between Cl and I Cor is much greater.

VII.9-28, it is certain that he is not copying from Cl. The use of the version, which formed the basis of Θ, is by no means limited to Cl and Justin. Origen, ClAlex, Irenaeus, Hermas, Barnabas, the Greek version of Baruch, and NT writings such as Heb, Rev, Mk, and Mt also follow it.[35] Sw says, " . . . . the inference has been drawn that there were two pre-Christian versions of Daniel, both passing as 'LXX', one of which is preserved in the Chigi MS, whilst the other formed the basis of Theodotion's revision."[36]

In the passage of Is, Cl agrees with the text represented by LXX-ASQΓ against LXX-B. This composite quotation is introduced by the formula, λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή.

Is LXIV.3 (Cl XXXIV.8) ἃ] The omission of this word improves the Greek.

ὁ θεός] Cl has κύριος probably because he uses the word alsewhere in this section.

ἀγαπῶσιν] In his quotation from Paul, Cl goes back to the LXX of Is LXIV.4, probably regarding that as the source of Paul's quotation. At least he felt that there was resemblance between I Cor II.9 and Is LXIV.4. The similarity between Paul and the Heb is apparent, e.g. ὀφθαλμός for ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν (LXX), εἶδεν for εἶδον (LXX), the omission of καὶ τα ἔργα σου ἃ (LXX adds), and αὐτόν for ἔλεον (LXX); and it can be explained either by a hypothesis that Paul is quoting from a lost Greek version which was textually nearer to his passage than the LXX is, or by a conjecture that he is quoting from the Heb, or by a probability that he is quoting the LXX with great freedom. The first explanation is based on a guess and may be dismissed; the second is impossible because it is generally accepted and proved that Paul's Old Testament was the LXX, and because there are many divergences as well as similarities between Paul and the Heb; the last is a very helpful supposition in view of Paul's habitual freedom. As to the addition of ἐπὶ καρδίαν

Ps XLIX.16-23 quoted in Cl XXXI.7-12

16 τῷ δὲ ἁμαρτωλῷ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ἵνα τί σὺ διηγῇ τὰ δικαιώματά μου· καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεις τὴν διαθήκην μου διὰ στόματός σου; 17 σὺ δὲ ἐμίσησας παιδείαν καὶ ἐξέβαλες τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. 18 εἰ ἐθεώρεις κλέπτην, συνέτρεχες αὐτῷ, καὶ μετὰ μοιχῶν τὴν μερίδα σου ἐτίθεις· 19 τὸ στόμα σου

[16]ולרשע אמר אלהים מה-לך לספר חקי ותשא בריתי עלי-פיך
[17]ואתה שנאת מוסר ותשלך דברי אחריך[18]אם-ראית גנב ותרץ
עמו ועם מנאפים חלקך [19]פיך שלחת ברעה ולשונך תצמיד מרמה

---

16 διά: ἐπί Cl-A(διά Cl-CS c. LXX) MT.

---

16 עלי διά / לרשע ἁμαρτωλῷ / 17 ו of ואתה om. / 18 ו of ותרץ om. / ἐτίθεις added after μερίδα σου, but it is understood in Heb. / 19 שלחת ברעה ἐπλεόνασεν κακίαν.

ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, Li suggests that Paul might have been influenced by Is LXV.16,17 οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν . . . . οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν. The phrase occurs in other writings too: II Cl XI.7 ἃς οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη, cf. II Cl XIV.5; Mart.Polyc.II.3 ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη, also cf. ClAlex *Ep.ad Virg.*I.9.[37] Cl's quotation is introduced by the formula λέγει γάρ.

Ps XLIX.16-23 16 διά] Cl improves the Greek by substituting διά by ἐπί. The identity of Cl and MT appears to be accidental.

21 ἀνομίαν] In the LXX, B reads ἀνομίαν, but S reads ἀνομε (later corrected into ανομειαν = ἀνομίαν).

ἐπλεόνασεν κακίαν, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσά σου περιέπλεκεν δολιότητα· 20 καθήμενος κατὰ ταῦ ἀδελφαῦ σου κατελάλεις, καὶ κατὰ ταῦ υἱαῦ τῆς μητρός σου ἐτίθεις σκάνδαλον. 21 ταῦτα ἐποίησας, καὶ ἐσίγησα· ὑπέλαβες ἀνομίαν ὅτι ἔσομαί σοι ὅμοιος. ἐλέγξω

[20]תשב באחיך תדבר בבן־אמך תתן־דפי [21]אלה עשית והחרשתי
דמית היות־אהיה כמוך אוכיחך ואערכה לעיניך [22]בינו־נא זאת

---

21 ἀνομίαν(ἄνομε LXX-S*): ἄνομε Cl(ἀνομαι Cl-A,ἀνομίαν Cl-S) / παραστήσω: + σε Cl / 22 ἁρπάσῃ(+ ὡς λέων LXX-R): + ὡς λέων.

καὶ is inserted before κατὰ του υἱαῦ / תתן־דפי ἐτίθεις σκάνδαλον / 21 after ὑπέλαβες LXX adds ἀνομίαν / LXX adds ὅτι after ἀνομίαν, which is implied in Heb / לעיניך

ἀνομίαν is read by Justin *Dial.*22, ClAlex *Strom.*vi, but ἄνομε ClAlex *Strom.*iv.14. In the text of Cl, S reads ἀνομίαν for ἄνομε with the LXX. Cl-A shows how easy was the transition from one to the other, ανομαι(ἄνομε) and ἀνομια(= ἀνομίαν). "Though ἄνομε makes better sense, the original reading of the LXX here must have been ἀνομίαν; for the translators must have misread דמית היות אהיה 'Thou thoughtest, I shall surely be', as if דמית הוות אהיה 'Thou thoughtest destruction (or iniquity), I shall be', since הוות is elsewhere translated by ἀνομία, Ps LVII.2, XCIV.20; and Theodotion, whose version agrees with the LXX, must have read it in the same way."[38]

παραστήσω] The word σε is omitted in LXX-BS and doubtless had no place in the original text of this version which agrees with the Hebrew,"I will lay in order(the matter) before thee."

22 ἁρπάσῃ] Cl adds ὡς λέων. These words are wanting in

σε καὶ παραστήσω κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου. 22 σύνετε δὴ ταῦτα, οἱ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι ταῦ θεαῦ, μήποτε ἁρτάσῃ καὶ μὴ ᾖ ὁ ῥυόμενος· 23 θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με, καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδός, ᾗ δείξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον ταῦ θεαῦ.

שכחי אלוה פן־אטרף ואין מציל 23זבח תודה יכבדנני ושם
דרך אראנו בישע אלהים

Ps CIII.4 quoted in Cl XXXVI.3(= Heb I.7)

ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐταῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐταῦ πῦρ φλέγον.

Ps CIV.4 עשה מלאכיו רוחות משרתיו אש להט

Ps CIII.4 πῦρ φλέγον LXX-BS(πυρος φλεγα LXX-A^a): πυρὰς φλόγα Cl Heb(tr. Cl-C).

κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου / 22 אטרף ἁρπάσῃ / 23 זבח θυσία, probably reading זבח / שם ἐκεῖ, probably reading שָׁם / ᾗ is added after ὁδός. By these changes, which are due to the ignorance of the translator, the meaning of the last clause was slightly altered.

Ps CIII.4 καί is inserted after πνεύματα in the LXX.

---

the LXX and the Heb. They must have come from Ps VII.3, either as a gloss in Cl's text of the LXX or as inadvertantly inserted by him in a quotation made from memory. Ps VII.3 reads as follows: μήποτε ἁρπάσῃ ὡς λέων τὴν ψυχήν μου. This quotation is introduced by the formula λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή.

Ps CIII.4 πῦρ φλέγον] Aquila has πῦρ λάβρον, Symm. πυρίνην φλόγα. The word πυρός must have been used by Hebraism with the force of an adjective, "fiery," or "fierce". Cl-C transposes the words and reads φλόγα πυρός. The intermediary

Ps II.7,8 quoted in Cl XXXVI.4

7 υἱός μου εἶ συ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγγέννηκά σε· 8 αἴτησαι παρ' ἐμαῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς.
Heb I.5(=V.5) υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.
Acts XIII.33 υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

[7]בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך [8]שאל ממני ואתנה גוים נחלתך
ואחזתך אפסי־ארץ

---

8 LXX adds σοι after δώσω (Heb implies it)

stage of the transition from πῦρ φλέγον to πυρὸς φλόγα is shown by the reading of LXX-A^a πυρὸς φλεγᾶ. Cl is apparently quoting from Heb with the formula γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως.

Ps II.7,8 A word-for-word quotation from Ps II.7,8, which is an accurate translation of the Heb. This citation is preceded by the words οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης. Heb I.5, V.5 and Acts XIII.33 are also quoting from the same source. It is interesting to note that the wuotation in Acts has the formula citandi, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ. These words indicate that the second Ps was already known as such when the Book of Acts was written.

Ps CIX.1 The LXX is a faithful rendering of the Heb. The words πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν introduce this word-for-word reproduction of Ps CIX.1. It is impossible to determine whether Cl is following Ps or Heb, because these three passages

Ps CIX.1 quoted in Cl XXXVI.5 (= Heb I.13)

κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.

Ps CX.1 שב לימיני עד־אשית איביך הדם לרגליך

Job IV.16-18,XV.15,IV.19-V.5 quoted in Cl XXXIX.3-9

16 οὐκ ἦν μορφὴ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου, ἀλλ' ἢ αὔραν καὶ φωνὴν ἤκουον 17 Τί γάρ; μὴ καθαρὸς ἔσται βροτὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἄμεμπτος ἀνήρ; 18 εἰ κατὰ παίδων αὐτοῦ οὐ πιστεύει, κατὰ δὲ ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ σκολιόν τι ἐπενόησεν, (Job XV.15) οὐρανὸς δὲ οὐ καθαρὸς ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ. (Job IV.19-V.5) 19 τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντες οἰκίας πηλίνας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἐσμεν, ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον· 20 καὶ ἀπὸ πρωίθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας οὐκέτι εἰσίν, παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῆσαι ἀπώλοντο· 21 ἐνεφύσησεν

Job IV.16-18 [16]תמונה לנגד עיני דממה וקול אשמע[17]האנוש מאלוה
יצדק אם־מעשהו יטהר־גבר[18]הן בעבדיו לא יאמין ובמלאכיו ישים תהלה
Job XV.15 ושמים לא־זכו בעיניו Job IV.19-V.5 [19]אף שכני
בתי־חמר אשר־בעפר יסודם ידכאום לפני־עש[20]ובקר לערב יכתו

Job IV.16-18 etc. IV.17 ἐναντίον: ἔναντι Cl-A c. LXX-SA(ἀναντίον Cl-C c. LXX-B) / XV.15 ἐναντίον: ἐνώπιον Cl / IV.19 τοὺς δέ: ἔα δὲ, οἱ Cl / 21 γάρ: - Cl / ἐξηράνθησαν ἀπώλοντο LXX-BS(ἐτελεύτησαν LXX-A): ἐτελεύτησαν Cl / V.1

IV.16 LXX inserts οὐκ at the beginning of the passage. It is probably due to the intention of the translator to avoid the anthropomorphic expression of the Heb. Duhm is of the same opinion. / LXX adds ἀλλ' before ἢ αὔραν / דממה ἢ αὔραν / 17 τί γάρ; is inserted at the beginning of this verse / אנוש βροτός / מאלוה ἐναντίον κυρίου. The translator seems to evade the comparison of man with God / מַעֲשֵׂהוּ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, probably reading מֵעֲשֵׂהוּ / IV.18 הן is

----

are all alike. Cf.Mk XII.36,Mt XXII.44, Lk XX.43. Both Mk and Mt have ὑποκάτω for ὑποπόδιον.

γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν ἀπώλοντο παρὰ τὸ μὴ, ἔχειν αὐτοὺς σοφίαν. V.1 ἐπικάλεσαι δέ, εἴ τίς σοι ὑπακούσεται, ἢ εἴ τινα ἀγγέλων ἁγίων ὄψῃ. 2 καὶ γὰρ ἄφρονα ἀναιρεῖ ὀργή, πεπλανημένον δὲ θανατοῖ ζῆλος. 3 ἐγὼ δὲ ἑώρακα ἄφρονας ῥίζαν βάλλοντας,

מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו [21]הלא-נסע יתרם בם ימותו ולא בחכמה
[V.1]קרא-נא היש עונך ואל-מי מקדשים תפנה [2]כי לאויל יהרג-כעש
ופתה תמית קנאה [3]אני ראיתי אויל משריש ואקוב נוהו פתאם

ἀγγέλων ἁγίων: tr. Cl / 5 ἐκεῖνοι: ἐκείνοις Cl-AC(ἐκεῖνοι Cl-S) / συνήγαγον LXX-BS(ἐθέρισαν LXX-A): ἡτοίμασται Cl-AC (ἡτοίμασαν Cl-S).

----

rendered εἰ / ישים תהלה σκολιόν τι ἐπενόησεν / IV.19 אף is rendered δέ / עש . . . . אשר ἐξ ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἐσμεν, ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον. The figurative speech, "the house of clay," is taken literally by the LXX.

IV.17 ἐναντίον] Cl has ἔναντι, but elsewhere, i.e. in XVI.3 and 7, he quotes the LXX exactly and has ἐναντίον. The reason for this change here is not known.

XV.15 ἐναντίον] Cl has ἐνώπιον. There is no textual evidence which will explain why Cl changed the word.

IV.19 τοὺς δέ] The variant in Cl may have been caused by his insertion of Job XV.15. The insertion of this passage is strange. The only plausible explanation is what is given by Li. He says, "The fact that nearly the same words occur as the first clause of XV.15, which are found likewise in IV.18, has led Clement to insert the second clause also of this same verse in the other passage to which it does not belong."[41]

ἀλλ' εὐθέως ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δίαιτα. 4 πόρρω γένοιντο οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ σωτηρίας, κολαβρισθείησαν ἐπὶ θύραις ἡσσόνων, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος· 5 ἃ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι συνήγαγον, δίκαιοι ἔδονται, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐκ κακῶν οὐκ ἐξαίρεται ἔσονται.

[4]ירחקו בניו מישע וידכאו בשער ואין מציל [5]אשר
קצירו רעב יאכל ואל-מצנים יקחהו ושאף צמים חילם

IV.20 καὶ is added at the beginning of this verse / יכתו οὐκέτι εἰσίν / לנצח . . מבלי παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυταῦς βοηθῆσαι / IV.21 בחכמה . . . חלא is rendered ἐνεφύσησεν . . . σοφίαν. The meaning is entirely different from the original. For the first part of the verse, the LXX has a sentence from Is XL.24. Duhm thinks this to be either a fitting for an unreadable text or a marginal note crept into the text.[39] / V.1 δέ is added after ἐπικάλεσαι / נא is omitted / מקדשים ἀγγέλων ἁγίων. LXX's explanation is justified by XV.15 / 2 καί added at the beginning of the verse / 3 δέ added after ἐγώ / אקוב ἐβρώθη, probably reading רקב / וידכאו κολαβρισθείησαν / בשער ἐπὶ θύραις ἡσσόνων / 5 LXX differs greatly from the Heb in this verse. γὰρ inserted after ἃ / אשר קצירו is rendered ᾶ ἐκεῖνοι συνήγαγον, reading אשר קצרו and thus improving the reading of the Heb / Instead of רעב, the LXX has δίκαιοι. The rest of the verse is so different that a comparison is impossible. These variants support Driver and Gray in maintaining that "the version is often free and paraphrastic."[40]

IV.21 ἐξηράνθησαν ἀπώλοντο] Cl improves the Greek by the substitution of ἐτελεύτησαν.

V.1 ἀγγέλω ἁγίων] No reason for the transposition is apparent. It is probably due to the transcriptional error.

5 ἐκεῖνοι συνήγαγον] By reading ᾶ γὰρ ἐκείνοις ἡτοίμασται, Cl gives a paraphrastic rendering of the LXX.

Is LX.17	Cl XLII.5
δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόμους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.	καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει.

Is LX.17 ושמתי פקדתך שלום ונגשיך צדקה

A detailed comparison is impossible.

ושמתי δώσω / שלום ἐν εἰρήνῃ / צדקה ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, making the sense of the Heb clear.

Job IV.16-18 etc. Throughout this quotation Cl appears to follow LXX-A more closely than LXX-SB. For instance, in v. 5, LXX-B adds τοῦ before κυρίου against LXX-A and Cl; in v. 5, LXX-SB read τοὺς δέ, but LXX-A's reading is closer to Cl; in v.6, LXX-SB read ἐξηράνθησαν against LXX-A which reads ἐτελεύτησαν with Cl. But in v.9 LXX-A stands alone reading ἐξερεθήσονται for ἐξαίρετοι ἔσονται. Therefore we may conclude that the LXX text of Cl was different from our LXX, but it was close to LXX-A in this passage. This quotation is introduced by the words γέγραπται γάρ.

Is LX.17 Cl, despite the formula citandi, οὕτως γὰρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή, quotes loosely from the LXX, applying the passage to the Christian ministry. Some variations, therefore, are to be explained accordingly. Hatch is of the opinion that "Clement may very possible have had before him a revised text of the LXX in which ἐπισκόπους was used in the present passage."[42]

Num XII.7	Cl XLIII.1
οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου	ὁ μακάριος πιστὸς θεράπων
Μωυσῆς· ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ	ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ.
μου πιστός ἐστιν.	Heb III.5
לא-כן עבדי משה	Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ
בכל-ביתי נאמן הוא	τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων.

Ps XVII.26b-27 quoted in Cl XLVI.3

26b μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἀθῴου ἀθῷος ἔσῃ 27 καὶ μετὰ ἐκλεκτοῦ ἐκλεκτὸς ἔσῃ, καὶ μετὰ στρεβλοῦ διαστρέψεις.

Ps XVIII.26b-27 ^{26b}עם-נבר תמים תתמם ^{27}עם-נבר תתברר
ועם-עקש תתפתל

Ps XVII.26b-27 26b תמים ἀθῴου / LXX adds καί at the beginning of this verse / נבר ἐκλεκτοῦ These are translation variants.

Num XII.7 LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb. This is a loose quotation from the LXX of Num XII.7. Cf. Heb III.5. Justin *Dial.*56.1 combines two epithets, Μωϋσῆς σὺν ὁ μακάριος καὶ πιστὸς θεράπων θεοῦ κ.τ.λ., probably quoting from Cl.

Ps XVII.26b-27 This quotation, which is introduced by the words πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει, is a word-for-word reproduction of the passage in the LXX Ps XVII.26b-27. The application of the passage by Cl to the influence of good or bad companionship is wrong. He takes the word μετά to mean "in the company of," while in the original passage it means "in the case of." Furthermore the subject of the verbs(God) is applied to the Christian.

Ps CXVII.19,20 quoted in Cl XLVIII.2

19 ἀναίξατέ μαι πύλας δικαιοσύνης· εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐταῖς ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ· 20 αὕτη ἡ πύλη ταῦ κυρίου· δίκαιοι εἰσελεύσονται ἐν αὐτῇ.

Ps CXVIII.19,20 [19]פתחו־לי שערי־צדק אבא־בם אודה יה
[20]זה־השער ליהוה צדיקים יבאו בו

---

19 εἰσελθών: pr. ἵνα Cl-SK ClAlex(- ἵνα Cl-ACL) / ἐξομολογήσομαι LXX ClAlex *Strom.*VI.VIII: ἐξομολογήσωμαι Cl ClAlex *Strom.*I.VII.

The LXX is a faithful translation of the Heb.

---

19 εἰσελθών] Cl adds ἵνα before εἰσελθών in order to improve the Greek.

ἐξομολογήσομαι] Cl has a subjunctive because of the addition of ἵνα. ClAlex *Strom.*I.VII loosely quotes with interpolation of his own this passage of Cl as far as ἤτω ἁγνὸς ἐν ἔργοις. He gives his authority as "Clemens, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, while expounding the differences of those who are approved according to the Church, says expressly . . . ." Here ClAlex agrees with Cl in reading ἵνα . . . . ἐξομολογήσωμαι, but differs from him in another place, namely in *Strom.*VI.VIII. Apparently, therefore, in the first quotation, ClAlex is quoting from Cl, in the second, directly from Ps CXVII.19,20.

With regard to these passages of ClAlex, the statement of Li is significant, "His two quotations do not agree exactly either with the original text of Cl or with one another. These facts make it clear that he cites chiefly from memory,

Is XXVI.20	Cl L.4
βάδιζε, λαός μου εἴσελθε εἰς τὰ ταμίειά σου, ἀπόκλεισον τὴν θύραν σου, ἀποκρύβηθι μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου. Ez XXXVII.12 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀνοίγω ὑμῶν τὰ μνήματα καὶ ἀνάξω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν μνημάτων ὑμῶν καὶ εἰσάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ισραηλ.	εἰσέλθετε εἰς τὰ ταμεῖα μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ἕως οὗ παρέλθῃ ἡ ὀργὴ καὶ ὁ θυμός μου, καὶ μνησθήσομαι ἡμέρας ἀγαθῆς, καὶ ἀναστήσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν θηκῶν ὑμῶν.

Is XXVI.20 לך עמי בא בחדריך וסגר דלתיך
בעדך חבי כמעט־רגע עד־יעבור־זעם

Ez XXXVII.12 הנה אני פתח את־קברותיכם והעליתי אתכם
מקברותיכם עמי והבאתי אתכם אל־אדמת ישראל

Is XXVI.20 ו of וסגר om. / בעדך om. / LXX adds κυρίου after ὀργή, paraphrastic / Ez XXXVII.12 עמי om.

---

and this must be borne in mind in using his quotations to correct the text of the Roman Clement."[43] Cl's quotation is introduced by the words καθὼς γέγραπται.

Is XXVI.20 etc. A detailed comparison between Cl and the LXX cannot be made. Any exact or nearly exact source of this passage has not been found. Probably this is a combination of the two passages, Is XXVI.20 and Ez XXXVII.12. Hatch suggests that this citation may have been taken from 4 (= 5) Esdras II.16 which reads *et resuscitabo mortuos de locis suis et de monumentis educam illos etc.*[44] However 5 Esdras, according to Knopf, is later than Cl.[45]

In the text of Cl-A's text is corrupt and the word for εἰσέλθετε is not clear. Li thinks it possible that A reads

Ps XXXI.1,2 quoted in Cl L.6	Rom IV.7,8
1 μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· 2 μακάριος ἀνήρ, οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐταῦ δόλος.	7 μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· 8 μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

Ps XXXII.1,2 [1]אשרי נשוי־פשע כסוי חטאה [2]אשרי־אדם לא־יחשב
יהוה לו עון ואין ברוחו רמיה

---

1 καί is inserted after ἀνομίαι / 2 ו of ואין om. / LXX adds ἔστιν after οὐδέ (understood in Heb) / ברוחו ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐταῦ.

εἴσελθε with the LXX, but the other authorities point to εἰσέλθετε. This quotation has the formula citandi, γέγραπται γάρ.

Ps XXXI.1,2 This quotation is taken from the LXX Ps XXXI.1,2 word for word. The same passage is also quoted by Paul in Rom IV.7,8, where the last clause οὐδέ ἔστιν . . . αὐτοῦ δόλος is missing. This fact shows that Cl is following the Old Testament passage rather than the passage in Rom at least in this instance. The formula citandi of this quotation is γέγραπται γάρ.

Num XVI.33 etc. A detailed comparison between LXX and Cl is impossible in this case. Li and GHZ indicate only θάνατος ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς as a quotation, while La thinks κατέβησαν γὰρ εἰς ᾅδου is another quotation. GH does not print

Num XVI.33	Cl LI.4
κατέβησαν αὐτοὶ καὶ ὅσα ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ζῶντα εἰς ᾅδου. Ps XLVIII.15 ὡς πρόβατα ἐν ᾅδῃ ἔθεντα, θάνατος ποιμαίνει αὐτούς.	κατέβησαν γὰρ εἰς ᾅδου ζῶντες, καὶ θάνατος πομανεῖ αὐτούς.

Num XVI.33 וירדו הם וכל־אשר להם חיים שאלה
Ps XLIX.15 כצאן לשאול שתו מות ירעם

Ex XIV.23	Cl LI.5
τὰ ἅρματα καὶ αἱ ἀνάβαται	τὰ ἅρματα καὶ αἱ ἀνάβαται
Ex XIV.26	Ex XV.19
ἐπί τε τὰ ἅρματα καὶ τοὺς ἀναβάτας	σὺν ἅρμασιν καὶ ἀναβάταις
Ex XIV.28	
τὰ ἅρματα καὶ τοὺς ἀναβάτασ	

Ex XIV.23 רכבו ופרשיו Ex XIV.28 את־הרכב ואת־הפרשים
Ex XIV.26 על־רכבו ועל־פרשיו Ex XV.19 ברכבו ובפרשיו

Ex XIV.23 etc. Ex XIV.23,26 LXX adds definite articles and omits personal pronouns / Ex XV.19 LXX omits personal pronouns.

---

this passage as a quotation in their edition. Cl must have taken these from Num XVI.33 and Ps XLVIII.15.

Ex XIV.23 etc. Cl must have borrowed this expression from the story of Moses, which is found in several places in the Old Testament. Besides the above quotations, cf. also Jer LI.22 and Hag II.22.

Ps LXVIII.31-33 31 αἰνέσω . . . . αἰνέσει] The introductory words ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ of Cl are not found in the context of the LXX, but they express the sense of the

Ps LXVIII.31-33	Cl LII.2
31 αἰνέσω τὸ ὄνομα ταῦ θεαῦ μετ' ᾠδῆς, μεγαλυνῶ αὐτὸν ἐν αἰνέσει, 32 καὶ ἀρέσει τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ μόσχον νέον κέρατα ἐκφέροντα καὶ ὁπλάς, 33 ἰδέτωσαν πτωχοὶ καὶ εὐφρανθήτωσαν.	ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἀρέσει αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ μόσχον νέον κέρατα ἐκφέροντα καὶ ὁπλάς· ἰδέτωσαν πτωχοὶ καὶ εὐφρανθήτωσαν.

Ps LXIX.31-33 [31]אהללה שם-אלהים בשיר ואגדלנו בתודה [32]ותיטב
ליהוה משור פר מקרן מפרים [33]ראו ענוים ישמחו

---

31 εἰνέσω . . . . αἰνέσει: ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ Cl/ 32 τῷ θεῷ: αὐτῷ Cl

---

31 ו of ואגדלנו om. / בתודה is rendered ἐν αἰνέσει / 32 καί is added before ὁπλάς / 33 ענוים is rendered πτωχοί, and καί is added after it.

---

preceding verse αἰνέσω . . . . αἰνέσει.

32 τῷ θεῷ] Cl has αὐτῷ because he wants to avoid the repetition of τῷ κυρίῳ of the preceding verse.

AlAlex quotes with an interpolation of his own Cl's passage as far as θυσία γὰρ τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένου. He differs from Cl in reading φέροντα κέρατα for κέρατα ἐκφέροντα, here again proving the fact that his quotations of Cl are in general loose ones.

Cl-S omits ἐκφέροντα against other authorities and ClAlex. Cl-C characteristically omits the latter part of the quotation, δέρατα . . . . καὶ εὐφρανθήτωσαν. This quotation is introduced by the formula citandi, φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δαυείδ.

Ps XLIX.14,15	Cl LII.3
14 θῦσον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχάς σου· 15 καὶ ἐπικάλεσαί με ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως καὶ ἐξελοῦμαί σε, καὶ δοξάσεις με.	θῦσον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχάς σου· καὶ ἐπικάλεσαίμε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεώς σου, καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι σε, καὶ δοξάσεις με.
Ps L.19	
θυσία τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον.	θυσία γὰρ τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον.

Ps L.14,15 [14]זבח לאלהים תודה ושלם לעליון נדריך[15]וקראני
ביום צרה אחלצך ותכבדני
Ps LI.19 זבחי אלהים רוח נשברה

---

15 θλίψεως(+σου LXX-A): +σου Cl-A(-σου Cl-S) / 19 θυσία: +γάρ Cl

---

14 תודה θυσίαν αἰνεσεως / 15 καί is inserted before ἐξελουμαι.

---

15 θλίψεως] In adding σου after θλίψεως, Cl follows the reading of LXX-A. The omission of σου in Cl-S is characteristic of this version.

19 θυσία] γάρ is inserted by Cl after θυσία in order to smooth up the connection of the two passages.

Cl-C characteristically omits the sentence ἐπικάλεσαί με . . . . καὶ δοξάσεις με. ClAlex quoting Cl differs from it in reading τῷ κυρίῳ for τῷ ὑψίστῳ which has a scent of Hebraism. This quotation of Cl is introduced by the words καὶ πάλιν λέγει.

Deut IX.12-14 quoted in Cl LIII.2,3

12 κατάβηθι τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι ἠνόμησεν ὁ λαός σου, οὓς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· παρέβησαν ταχὺ ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ἧς ἐνετείλω αὐτοῖς· ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς χώνευμα. 13 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρός με Λελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς λέγων Ἑώρακα τὸ λαὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἰδοὺ λαὸς σκληροτράχηλος ἐστιν· 14 ἔασόν με ἐξολεθρεῦσαι αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ὑποκάτωθεν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ποιήσω σὲ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦτο.

Ex XXXII.7-10

7 καὶ ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν λέγων Βάδιζε τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν κατάβηθι· ἠνόμησεν γὰρ ὁ λαός σου, οὓς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· 8 παρέβησαν ταχὺ ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ἧς ἐνετείλω αὐτοῖς· ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς μόσχον καὶ προσκεκυνήκασιν αὐτῷ καὶ τεθύκασιν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπαν Οὗτοι οἱ θεοί σου, Ισραηλ, οἵτινες ἀνεβίβασάν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. 10 καὶ νῦν ἔασόν με καὶ θυμωθεὶς ὀργῇ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκτρίψω αὐτοὺς καὶ ποιήσω σὲ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα.

Deut IX.12-14 [12]קום רד מהר מזה כי שחת עמך אשר הוצאת ממצרים
סרו מהר מן-הדרך אשר צויתם עשו להם מסכה [13]ויאמר יהוה אלי
לאמר ראיתי את-העם הזה והנה עם-קשה-ערף הוא [14]הרף ממני
ואשמידם ואמחה את-שמם מתחת השמים ואעשה אותך לגוי-עצום ורב
ממנו:

Ex XXXII.7-10 [7]לך-רד כי שחת עמך אשר העלית מארץ מצרים
[8]סרו מהר מן-הדרך אשר צויתם עשו להם עגל מסכה וישתחוו-לו
ויזבחו-לו ויאמרו אלה אלהיך ישראל אשר העלוך מארץ מצרים[9]ויאמר
יהוה אל-משה ראיתי את-העם הזה והנה עם-קשה-ערף הוא [10]ועתה
הניחה לי ויחר-אפי בהם ואכלם ואעשה אותך לגוי גדול:

Deut 12 χώνευμα LXX-B c. MT(χωνευτα LXX-A): χωνεύματα Cl-AC(χωνευμα Cl-S) / 13 με: αὐτόν Cl / λαός: - Cl / σκληροτράχηλος ἐστιν: tr. Cl / 14 ἰσχυρον: θαυμαστόν Cl ClAlex *Strom.*IV.XIX.

Deut 12 ממצרים ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου / LXX inserts the words λελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς between the words πρός με and λέγων. / 14 ו of ואשמידם om. / LXX adds μέγα καὶ after

ἔφνος / ממנו ταῦτα. These variants point to a different text.

12 χώνευμα] Cl-AC reads χωνεύματα while Cl-S reads χώνευμα. Throughout the quotation we notice the harmonistic tendency of Cl-S. The reason why Cl changes χώνευμα into a plural is not clear.

13 με] This is not part of the quotation.

λαός] Cl improves the Greek by omitting this word which occurs already in the preceding clause.

σκληροτράχηλος ἐστιν] Cl transposes these words probably due to his omission of the word λαός.

14 ἰσχυρόν] Cl reads θαυμαστόν for the reason unknown to us. But the combination μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν occurs also in Cl XXVI.1 and L.1. ClAlex *Strom.* IV.XIX supports the reading of Cl, but he is apparently quoting from him.

In the text of the LXX itself many variant readings are found. At the beginning of the passage, MSS AFN add καί after ἀνάστηθι, but good MSS do not have it. In verse 12, B(Brooke and McLean) adds καί before ἐποίησαν ἑαυταῖς against the combind witness of AFGMNΘ. χώνευμα is read in B with the MT; A reads χωνευτά. In v.13, B^{c} adds λέγων after πρός με, but all important MSS reject this reading. In v.14, B inserts καὶ νῦν before ἔασον, and Brooke and McLean adds these words in their text. But all other MSS array against this reading. Cl's text of the LXX is dif-

Ex XXXII.31,32	Cl LIII.4
31 δέομαι, κύριε· ἡμάρτηκεν ὁ λαὸς	μηδαμῶς. κύριε· ἄφες
οὗτος ἁμαρτίαν μεγάλην καὶ ἐποίησεν	τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῷ λαῷ
ἑαυτοῖς θεοὺς χρυσοῦς. 32 καὶ νῦν	τούτῳ, ἢ κἀμὲ ἐξά-
εἰ μὲν ἀφεῖς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν,	λειψον ἐκ βίβλου
ἄφες· εἰ δὲ μή, ἐξάλειψόν με ἐκ τῆς	ζώντων.
βίβλου σου, ἧς ἔγραψας.	

[31]אנא חטא העם הזה חטאה גדלה ויעשו להם אלהי זהב [32]ועתה
אם-תשא חטאתם ואם-אין מחני נא מספרך אשר כתבת

---

31 אנא is rendered δέομαι, and κύριε is added after it /
32 תשא is rendered ἀφεῖς . . . . ἄφες.

---

ferent from these MSS.

In Cl, C reads ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου with all the MSS of the LXX, but S reads ἐξ Αἰγύπτου with the MT. AC read ἐποίησαν in accordance with LXX-A and the MT; while S corrects from LXX-B and reads καὶ ἐποίησαν.

It is generally accepted that καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν at the beginning of Cl LIII.3 is not part of the quotation, though its corresponding words are found in the LXX. This quotation of Cl from Deut IX.12-14 (cf. also Ex XXXII.7-10) has the formula citandi, εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.

Ex XXXII.31,32 A detailed comparison between Cl's loose quotation and the LXX is impossible in this case. In *Strom.* IV.XIX ClAlex gives the same quotation as Cl, whom he is apparently quoting. This quotation is preceded by the words καὶ εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς.

Ps XXIII.1 quoted in Cl LIV.3

ταῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς.

Ps XXIV.1 ליהוה הארץ ומלואה

Ps CXVII.18

παιδεύων ἐπαίδευσέν με ὁ
κύριος, καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ οὐ
παρέδωκέν με.

Prov III.12

ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει,
μαστιγαῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν παραδέχεται.

Ps CXVIII.18
יסר יסרני יה ולמות לא נתנני

Prov III.12 כי את־אשר יאהב
יהוה יוכיח וכאב את־בן ירצה

Cl LVI.3,4

3 παιδεύων ἐπαίδευσέν με ὁ
κύριος, καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ οὐ
παρέδωκέν με· 4 ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ
κύριος παιδεύει, μαστιγαῖ
δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃ παραδέχεται.

Heb XII.5,6

5 υἱέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας Κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου
ὑπ' αὐταῦ ἐλεγχόμενος· 6
ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει,
μαστιγαῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν
παραδέχεται.

Prov III.12 υἱόν: +ὅ Cl(+ὅν Heb)

* * *

Prov III.12 כאב is rendered μαστιγαῖ, probably reading יכאב / LXX adds πάντα before υἱόν / ירצה παραδέχεται A free rendering of the Heb.

* * *

Ps XXIII.1 A word-for-word quotation of the LXX Ps XXIII. 1. The LXX is faithful to the Heb. The word γάρ is not part of the quotation.

Ps. CXVII.18 etc. Hatch lists these two passages and the following one as a group. "But the want of cohesion between the third quotation and the two first makes it probable that this is rather a series of quotations on a cognate subject than a single quotation from a composite poem."[46]

In the Psalm ὁ before κύριος is omitted by LXX-S. Prov III.12 LXX-B reads ἐλέγχει for παιδεύει, and ὃ before παραδέχεται is not found in the text. This translation is little different from the Hebrew. As to the variants παιδεύει and ἐλέγχει, Li gives the following account: "The Syro-Hexaplar text wavers, giving the equivalent to παιδεύει in the text and to ἐλέγχει in the margin. In Heb. XII.6 it is quoted with παιδεύει as here: in Rev. III.19 both words are combined, ἐγὼ ὅσους ἐὰν φιλῶ, ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω. Clem. Alex. *Paed.* I.9 has παιδεύει, but his quotation is perhaps not independent of the Roman Clement. On the other hand Philo *de Conj. Erud. grat.* 31 quotes it with ἐλέγχει. This, which corresponds with the Hebrew, was probably the original reading of the LXX, and all the texts with παιδεύει may perhaps have been derived directly or indirectly from the quotation in the Epistle to the Hebres."[47]

Cl here is quoting from Ps and Prov, but is under the influence of Heb. This composite quotation is introduced by οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος.

Ps CXL.5 The word φησίν is not part of the quotation.

παιδεύσει με] Cl adds γάρ for the sake of a smooth connection with the preceding passage.

ἁμαρτωλου] The reason why Cl changes a singular into

Ps CXL.5	Cl LVI.5
παιδεύσει με δίκαιος ἐν ἐλέει καὶ ἐλέγξει με, ἔλαιον δὲ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, μὴ λιμανάτω τὴν κεφαλήν μου.	παιδεύσει με γάρ,[φησίν,] δίκαιος ἐν ἐλέει καὶ ἐλέγξει με, ἔλαιον δὲ ἁμαρτωλῶν μὴ λιμανάτω τὴν κεφαλήν μου.

Ps CXLI.5 יהלמני צדיק חסד ויוכיחני שמן ראש אל-יני ראשי

Job V.17-26 quoted in Cl LVI.6-15

17 μακάριος δὲ ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἤλεγξεν ὁ κύριος, νουθέτημα δὲ παντοκράτορος μὴ ἀμαναίνου. 18 αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ, καὶ πάλιν ἀποκαθίστησιν· ἔπαισεν, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐταῦ

Job V.17-26 17 δέ: - Cl

Job V.17-26 17 הנה om. / δέ added after μακάριος / מוסר is rendered νουθέτημα / 18 יחבש πάλιν ἀποκαθίστησιν /

---

a plural is not known.

As to the reading ἔλαιον in Cl scholars are divided in opinion. According to Li, Cl reads ἔλεος, but GH, Kn and La are of the opinion that the correct reading is ἔλαιον with the LXX. This reading is supported by CS; A has ἔλαιος(= ἔλεος). In the LXX, S omits δέ after ἔλαιον against ABR, but Cl follows the reading of the latter. This quotation is introduced by the word φησίν.

Job V.17-26 17 δέ] This conjunction is not necessary for Cl.

19 σε ἐξελεῖται] Cl transposes these words. This may be due to a transcriptional error.

ἐάσαντο. 19 ἑξάκις ἐξ ἀναγκῶν σε ἐξελεῖται ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑβδόμῳ οὐ μὴ ἅψηταί σου κακόν. 20 ἐν λιμῷ ῥύσεταί σε ἐκ θανάτου ἐν πολέμῳ δὲ ἐκ χειρὸς σιδήρου λύσει σε. 21 ἀπὸ μάστιγος γλώσσης σε κρύψει, καὶ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐρχομένων. 22 ἀδίκων καὶ ἀνόμων καταγελάσῃ, ἀπὸ δὲ θηρίων ἀγρίων οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς· 23 θῆρες γὰρ ἄγριοι εἰρηνεύσουσίν σοι. 24 εἶτα

[17]הנה אשרי אנוש יוכחנו אלוה ומוסר שדי אל-תמאס [18]כי הוא
יכאיב ויחבש ימחץ וידו תרפינה [19]בשש צרות יצילך ובשבע
לא-יגע בך רע [20]ברעב פדך ממות ובמלחמה מידי חרב [21]בשוט לשון
תחבא ולא-תירא משוד כי יבוא [22]לשד ולכפן תשחק ומחית הארץ
אל-תירא [23]כי עם-אבני השדה בריתך וחית השדה השלמה-לך

---

19 σε ἐξελεῖται: tr. Cl / οὐ μὴ ἅψηται (οὐχ ἅψεται A): οὐχ ἅψεται Cl (ουκοψεται Cl-A, οὐ μὴ ἅψηται Cl-C) / 21 οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς LXX-BS (ου φοβηθηση LXX-A): οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσῃ Cl / ἀπὸ κακῶν: - ἀπό Cl / ἐρχομένων (επερχομενων LXX-S): ἐπερχομενων Cl.

---

19 בשש צרות ἑξάκις ἐξ ἀναγκῶν / 20 LXX adds λύσει σε after σιδήρου / 21 משוד ἀπὸ κακῶν It is interesting to note that LXX translates מן literally ἀπό / כי יבוא ἐρχομένων / 22 לשד ἀδίκων / לכפם ἀνόμων, probably reading שדד and כפר, Aramaic.[48] / 23 The first clause עם . בריתך. is missing, probably owing to a scribe's error / ו of וחית om.

οὐ μὴ ἅψηται] The substitution of οὐχ for οὐ μή in Cl is inexplicable, because Cl reads οὐ μή in v.21 in accord with the LXX. ἅψεται is due to the substitute οὐχ.

21 φοβηθῇς] φοβηθήσῃ (fut.ind.mid.) of Cl cannot be explained satisfactorily except as a transcriptional error, for in the following verse the phrase οὐ μὴ φοβηθῃς of the LXX is copied faithfully by him.

ἀπὸ κακῶν] This is a literal translation of the Heb.

γνώσῃ ὅτι εἰρηνεύσει σου ὁ αἶκος, ἡ δὲ δίαιτα τῆς σκηνῆς σου οὐ μὴ ἁμαρτῃ· 25 γνώσῃ δὲ ὅτι πολὺ τὸ σπέρμα σου, τὰ δὲ τέκνα σου ἔσται ὥσπερ τὸ παμβότανον ταῦ ἀγραῦ. 26 ἐλεύσῃ δὲ ἐν τάφῳ ὥσπερ σῖτος ὥριμος κατὰ καιρὸν θεριζόμενος ἢ ὥσπερ θιμωνιὰ ἅλωνος καθ' ὥραν συγκομισθεῖσα.

24וידעת כי־שלום אהלך ופקדת נוך ולא תחטא 25וידעת כי־רב
זרעך וצאצאיך כעשב הארץ 26תבוא בכלה אלי־קבר כעלות גדיש בעתו

---

25 ἔσται: - Cl

---

24 LXX has εἶτα instead of καί at the beginning of the verse. / אהלך σου ὁ οἶκος. The rest of the verse is different, and it is impossible to make a comparison of the two. However, the sense remains the same in both. / 25 LXX adds ἔσται after τέκνα σου / LXX differs greatly from the Heb, but the sense of the Heb is retained. These variants are largely due to the difference in the original texts.

Cl improves the Greek by omitting ἀπό.

ἐρχομένων] ἐπερχομένων of Cl fits in better with the context.

25 ἔσται] Cl omits this word probably to harmonize with the first clause of this verse where the verb is absent.

In v.23, Orig. under ⁎ adds with the Heb. the following words, οτι ματα των λιθων του αγρου η διαθηκη σου. Cl in the main follows LXX-BS rather than LXX-A in this quotation. Examples are numerous: (1) v.18: πατάξει(A) for ἔπαισεν(BS Cl); (2) v.18: ἰάσονται(A) for ἰάσαντο(BS Cl); (3) v.20: om. δὲ(A) δὲ(BS Cl); (4) The most striking deviation of A is the addition at the end of v.21 (after κακῶν ἐρχομενων) of the words, και ου φοβηθηση απο ταλαιπωριας, οτι ελευσεται ταλαιπωρια.

Prov I.23-33 quoted in Cl LVII.3-7

23 ἰδοὺ προήσομαι ὑμῖν ἐμῆς πναῆς ῥῆσιν, διδάξω δὲ ὑμᾶς τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον. 24 ἐπειδὴ ἐκάλουν καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε, καὶ ἐξέτεινον λόγους καὶ οὐ προσείχετε, 25 ἀλλὰ ἀκύρους ἐποιεῖτε ἐμὰς βουλάς, ταῖς δὲ ἐμαῖς ἐλέγχοις ἠμειθήσατε, 26 τοιγαραῦν κἀγὼ τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ἀπωλείᾳ ἐπιγελάσομαι, καταχαραῦμαι δὲ ἡνίκα ἂν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν ὄλεθρος,27 καὶ ὡς ἂν ἀφίκηται ὑμῖν ἄφνω θόρυβος, ἡ δὲ καταστροφὴ ὁμοίως καταιγίδι παρῇ, καὶ ὅταν

23הנה אביעה לכם רוחי אודיעה דברי אתכם24יען קראתי ותמאנו
נטיתי ידי ואין מקשיב 25ותפרעו כל־עצתי ותוכחתי לא אביתם
26גם־אני באיעכם אשחק אלעג בבא פחדכם 27בבא כשאוה פחדכם

---

25 ἐμὰς βουλάς: pr. τὰς Cl / 27 ὁμοίως: ὁμοία Cl /

---

23 רוחי is rendered ἐθῆς πναῆς ῥῆσιν, paraphrastic, perhaps to avoid the expression πνοὴν προΐεσθαι = to die / LXX inserts δέ after διδάξω / 24 ותמאנו καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε, a free rendering / ידי λόγους, probably in accordance with ῥῆσιν and λόγον of the preceding verse. / אין מקשיב is rendered οὐ προσείχετε, in comformity to the context. / 25 כל־עצתי is rendered ἐμας βουλάς / ותוכחתי ταῖς δὲ ἐμαῖς ἐλέγχοις / 26 LXX adds τοιγαροῦν before κἀγώ /

There are many other instances where A stands alone. The points in which Cl's quotation agrees with A, as against BS(e.g. οὐχ ἄψεται for οὐ μὴ ἄψεται), are insignificant. This quotation has the formula, πάλιν λέγει.

Prov I.23-33 25 ἐμὰς βουλάς] Cl improves the Greek by prefixing τάς in accordance with ταῖς of the following clause.

27 ὁμοίως] Cl reads ὁμοία. He never uses the word ὁμοίως in his Epistle, but he uses ὅμοιος in another place, e.g. XXXV.9 cit. However it cannot be inferred definitely

ἔρχηται ὑμῖν φλῖψις καὶ πολιορκία, ἢ ὅταν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν ὄλεθρος.28 ἔσται γὰρ ὅταν ἐπικαλέσησθέ με., ἐγὼ δὲ οὐχ εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν· ζητήσουσιν με κακοὶ καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσουσιν. 29 ἐμίσησαν γὰρ σοφίαν, τὸν δὲ φόβον ταῦ κυρίου οὐ προείλαντο 30 οὐδὲ ἤθελον ἐμαῖς προσέχειν βουλαῖς, ἐμυκτήριζον δὲ ἐμοὺς ἐλέγχους.31 τοιγαραῦν ἔδονται τῆς ἑαυτῶν ὁδαῦ τοὺς

ואידכם כסופה יאתה בבא עליכם צרה וצוקה [28]אז יקראנני ולא
אענה ישחרנני ולא ימצאנני [29]תחת כי־שנאו דעת ויראת יהוה
לא בחרו [30]לא־אבו לעצתי נאצו כל־תוכחתי [31]ויאכלו מפרי

καὶ ὅταν: ἢ ὅταν Cl / ἢ ὅταν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν ὄλεθρος: - Cl/

It inserts δέ after καταχαροῦμαι, and ὑμῖν after ἔρχηται / 27 LXX has καί at the beginning of the verse / It adds ὑμῖν after ἀφίκηται / פחדכם is rendered ἄφνω θόρυβος / ואידכם ἡ δὲ καταστροφή / om. כסופה יאתה / καί inserted before ὅταν ἔρχηται / צוקה πολιορκία / LXX adds at the end of the verse the words, ἢ ὅταν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν ὄλεθρος,to improve the meter?[49] / 28 אז γάρ / LXX adds ἔσται before γάρ / יקראנני (3 p.pl) LXX 2 p.pl / ולא אענה ἐγὼ δὲ οὐχ εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν., a free rendering / LXX adds κακοί as the subject of ζητήσουσιν A gloss?[50] / 29 תחת כי is rendered γάρ / 30 לא־אבו לעצתי οὐδὲ ἤθελον ἐμαῖς προσέχειν βουλαῖς, a free rendering / כל־תוכחתי ἐμοὺς ἐλέγχους / 31 ו at the very beginning is rendered τοιγαραῦν.

----

that the use of ὁμοίος is characteristic of Cl. The material is not sufficient to draw any conclusion.

καὶ ὅταν] Cl's ἢ ὅταν is due to homoeoarkton. The last clause of the LXX begins exactly alike, ἢ ὅταν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν.

ἢ ὅταν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν ὄλεθρος] The omission of these words in Cl is overlooked by GH, Li, Kn and La in their notes. This transcriptional error owing to homoeoarkton must have

καρπούς, καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀσεβείας πλησθήσονται· 32 ἀνθ' ὧν γὰρ ἠδίκουν νηπίους, φονευθήσονται, καὶ ἐξετασμὸς ἀσεβεῖς ὁλεῖ. 33 ὁ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλμίδι καὶ ἡσυχάσει ἀφόβως ἀπὸ μαντὸς κακοῦ.

דרכם וממעצתיהם ישבעו [32]כי משובת פתים תהרגם ושלות כסילים
תאבדם [33]ושמע לי ישכן-בטח ושאנן מפחד רעה

---

33 ἐλπίδι: + πεποιθώς Cl.

---

32 כי is rendered ἀνθ' ὧν γάρ / משובת פתים ἠδίκουν νηπίους / תהרגם φονευθήσονται / 32 תאבדם . . . שלות ἐξετασμὸς ἀσεβεῖς ὁλεῖ / 33 בטח επ' ἐλπίδι / LXX adds παντός before κακοῦ to make it definite. These variants indicate that the original of the LXX was different from MT.

---

taken place very early, for all the authorities for the text omit these words.

33 ἐλπίδι] Cl adds πεποιθώς. This word does not occur in the great MSS of the LXX(SBA). But Li thinks that πεποιθώς is genuine in the text of Cl, since Al dwells upon it in the beginning of the next chapter, κατασκηνώσωμεν πεποιθότες κ.τ.λ. ClAlex, in three different passages in *Strom.*, namely II.XXII; II.VIII; IV.XXIII, quotes this verse. Although ClAlex differs a little from both Cl and the LXX, he agrees with Cl in reading πεποιθώς. But from the manner in which he begins his quotation from Prov I.33, it may perhaps inferred that he had the passage of Cl in his mind. The Hebrew word, which is rendered ἐπ' ἐλπίδι in the LXX, is בטח and corresponds to πεποιθώς of Cl. It is not improbable to suppose that the LXX text of Cl may have had the word

Is LVII.15	Cl LIX.3
τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ ὕψιστος κατοικῶν τὸν αἰῶνα, ἅγιος ἐν ἁγίοις ὄνομα αὐτῷ, κύριος ὕψιστος ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος.	ὕψιστον ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἅγιον ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενον.

כי כה אמר רם ונשא שכן עד וקדוש שמו מרום וקדוש אשכון

כי om. / כה τάδε / LXX adds κύριος after λέγει / LXX adds ἐν ἁγίοις after ἅγιος / מרום וקדוש אשכון κύριος ὕψιστος ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος. This clause as well as the rest of the verse is a free rendering.

* * *

πεποιθώς as well as ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.

That Cl is following LXX-B very closely in this passage is manifest from the following evidence: (1) 24 ὑπηκούσατε S*A, (2) 25 ἠπειθήσατε Cl c. B: οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε V(οὐ προσείχετε rel.), (3) 29 σοφίαν Cl c. B: παιδιαν A, (4) 33 ἐπ' ἐλπίδι Cl c. B: ἐν ἐλπίδι SA.

Cl's quotation is introduced by the significant words οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία. The Book of Proverbs is frequently quoted by early Christian writers as ἡ πανάρετος σοφία. Whether the epithet πανάρετος was first used by Cl and derived from him by later writers, or not, it is impossible to say.

Is LVII.15 Kn and GH do not indicate in their printed texts all the quotations in the last seven chapters of Cl, which are so indicated by Li and La. In fact, most of them may better be classified as references and allusions instead of quotations.

Is XIII.11	Cl LIX.3
ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω.	ταπεινοῦντα ὕβριον ὑπερηφάνων.

Is XIII.11 וגאות עריצים אשפיל

Ps XXXII.10	Cl LIX.3
κύριος διασκεδάζει βουλὰς ἐθνῶν, ἀθετεῖ δὲ λογισμοὺς λαῶν.	διαλύοντα λογισμοὺς ἐθνῶν.

Ps XXXIII.10 יהוה הפיל עצת גוים הניא מחשבות עמים

Job V.11	Cl LIX.3
τὸν ποιοῦντα ταπεινοὺς εἰς ὕψος καὶ ἀπολωλότας ἐξεγείροντα.	[τὸν] ποιοῦντα ταπεινοὺς εἰς ὕψος [καὶ] τοὺς ὑψηλοὺς ταπεινοῦντα.
Is X.33	Ez XXI.31
οἱ ὑψηλοὶ ταπεινωθήσονται.	ἐταπείνωσας τὸ ὑψηλὸν καὶ τὸ ταπεινὸν ὕψωσας.
Ez XVII.24	I Sam II.7
ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ ταπεινῶν ξύλον ὑψηλὸν καὶ ὑψῶν ξύλον ταπεινόν.	κύριος πτωχίζει καὶ πλουτίζει, ταπεινοῖ καὶ ἀνυψοῖ.

Job V.11 לשום שפלים למרום וקדרים שגבו ישע
Is X.33 והגבהים ישפלו
Ez XVII.24 אני יהוה השפלתי עץ גבה הגבהתי עץ שפל
Ez XXI.31 (missing)
I Sam II.7 יהוה מוריש ומעשיר משפיל אף־מרומם

Ps XXXII. הפיל διασκεδάζει / עצת βουλάς / LXX adds δέ after ἀθετεῖ.

Job V.11 etc. Job V.11 לשום τὸν ποιοῦντα / קדרים ἀπολωλότας / שגבו ἐξεγείροντα / ישע om. / Is X.33 LXX

Cl's words here quoted are taken from the LXX Is LVII.15. The prayer in *Apost. Const.* 11 ὕψιστε ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, ἅγιε ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενε is doubtless taken from Cl. Li substitutes ὑψηλοῖς for ὑψίστοις (C).

Deut XXXII.39	Cl LIX.3
ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω. I Sam II.6 κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ. II Kgs V.7 καὶ εἶπεν μὴ ὁ θεὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ θανατῶσαι καὶ ζωοποιήσαι.	[τὸν] ἀποκτείνοντα καὶ ζῆν ποιοῦντα.

Deut XXXII.39 אני אמית ואחיה I Sam II.6 יהוה ממית ומחיה
II Kgs V.7 ויאמר האלהים אני להמית ולהחיות

---

is faithful to the Heb. / Ez XVII.24 השפלתי ὁ ταπεινῶν / καὶ is inserted after ὑψηλόν / הגבהתי ὑψῶν / I Sam II.7 מוריש πτωχίζει / מעשיר πλουτίζει / משפיל ταπεινοῖ / אף is rendered καί / מרומם ἀνυψοῖ. Most of these variants are translation variants.

Deut XXXII.39 etc. I Sam II.6 ממית θανατοῖ / מחיה ζωογονεῖ / I Kgs V.5 μή is added after εἶπεν. These are mostly translation variants.

Is XIII.11 Cl here is referring to the LXX Is XIII.11.

Ps XXXII.10 Cl's words are probably taken from Ps XXXII.10. A detailed comparison is impossible.

Job V.11 etc. The words τὸν and καὶ are not indicated by Li as part of the quotation. Cl's passage may be a confusion of Job V.11 and Is X.33. Besides the passages quoted above, see also Mt XXIII.12, Lk XIV.11 and XVIII.14.

Deut XXXII.39 etc. The word τὸν is omitted by Li from this quotation, which is probably taken from the LXX Deut. XXXII.39. LXX-B reads ἀποκτέννω for ἀποκτενῶ.

Ps CXVIII.114	Cl LIX.4
βοηθός μου καὶ ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ σύ. Ps CXIX.114 סתרי ומגני אתה	[ἀξιοῦμέν σε, δέσποτα,] βοηθὸν [γενέσθαι] καὶ ἀντιλήπτορα [ἡμῶν.]
I Kgs VIII.60	Cl LIX.4
ὅπως γνῶσιν πάντες αἱ λαοὶ τῆς γῆς ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός, αὐτὸς θεὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι.	γνώτωσάν σε ἅπαντα τὰ ἔθνη, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος.
II Kgs XIX.19	Ez XXXVI.23
καὶ γνώσονται πᾶσαι αἱ βασιλεῖαι τῆς γῆς ὅτι σύ κύριος ὁ θεὸς μόνος.	καὶ γνώσονται τὰ ἔθνη ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ἐν τῷ ἁγιασθῆναί με ἐν ὑμῖν κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν.

I Kgs VIII.60
למען דעת כל־אמי הארץ כי יהוה הוא האלהים אין עוד
II Kgs XIX.19 וידעו כל־ממלכות הארץ כי אתה יהוה אלהים לבדך
Ez XXXVI.23 וידעו הגוים כי־אני יהוה נאם אדני יהוה
בהקדשי בכם לעיניהם

Ps CXVIII.114 סתרי βοηθός μου / מגני ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου / εἶ is added before συ(understood in Heb). The LXX avoids the figurative speeches of the Heb.

I Kgs VIII.60 etc. I Kgs VIII.60 LXX adds αὐτὸς θεὸς καί after ὁ θεός / Ez XXXVI.23 om. ואם אדני יהוה Probably the translator thought it unnecessary because it is given on the preceding verse.

Ps CXVIII.114 Only the words βοηθὸν καὶ ἀντιλήπτορα ἡμῶν are treated by Li and La as a quotation. They came without doubt from the LXX Ps CXVIII.114.

I Kgs VIII.60 etc. These parallel passages have some similarities with Cl, but it is hard to determine where he has borrowed his expression.

Ps XCIX.3	Cl LIX.4
γνῶτε ὅτι κύριος αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ οὐχ ἡμεῖς, λαὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς αὐτοῦ.	ἡμεῖς λαός σου καὶ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς σου.
Ps XCIV.7	Ps LXXVIII.13
καὶ ἡμεῖς λαὸς νομῆς αὐταῦ καὶ πρόβατα χειρὸς αὐταῦ.	ἡμεῖς δὲ λαός σου καὶ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς σου.

Ps C.3 דעו כי־יהוה הוא אלהים הוא עשנו ולא אנחנו עמו וצאם מרעיתו

Ps XCV.7 ואנחנו עם מרעיתו וצאן ידו
Ps LXXIX.13 ואנחנו עמך וצאן מרעיתך

Joel II.13	Cl LX.1
ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.	ἐλεήμον καὶ οἰκτίρμον.
II Ch XXX.9	Sir II.11
ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ οἰκτίρμων κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.	οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων.

Joel II.13 כי־חנון ורחום הוא
II Ch XXX.9 כי־חנון ורחום יהוה אלהיכם

Ps XXXIX.3	Cl LX.2
κατηύθυνεν τὰ διαβήματά μου.	κατεύθυνον τὰ διαβήματα ἡμῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας πορεύεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ καλὰ καὶ εὐάρεστα ἐνώπιόν σου.
Ps CXVIII.133	
τὰ διαβήματά μου κατεύθυνον.	
Deut XIII.19	
ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐναντίον κυρίου ταῦ θεαῦ σαῦ.	

Ps XCIX.3 etc. Cl's language is common with the Psalmists.

Joel II.13 etc. These words must have been familiar to Cl. By changing -ων into -ον Cl makes these attributes of God an appelation. Cf. also Ps LXXV.15, CII.8, CX.4, CXI.4,

Deut XII.25(=28)

ἐὰν ποιήσῃς τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεαῦ σου.

Deut XXI.9

ἐὰν ποιήσῃς τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἔναντι κυρίου τοῦ θεαῦ σου.

I Kgs IX.4

καὶ σὺ ἐὰν πορευθῇς ἐνώπιον ἐμαῦ, καθὼς ἐπορεύθη Δαυιδ ὁ πατήρ σου, ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας.

I Kgs IX.4 ואתה אם-תלך לפני
כאשר הלך דוד אביך בתם-לבב

Deut XII.25
כי-תעשה הישר בעיני יהוה

Deut XII.28 כי תעשה הטוב והישר
בעיני יהוה אלהיך

Ps XL.3 כונן אשרי
Ps CXIX.133 פעמי הכן באמרתך
Deut XIII.19 לעשות הישר בעיני יהוה אלהיך
Deut XXI.9 כי-תעשה הישר בעיני יהוה

Ps LXVI.2

ἐπιφάναι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐταῦ ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς.

Ps LXXIX.4(=8,20)

ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου.

Ps LXVII.1 יאר פניו אתנו
Ps LXXX.4(=8,20) והאר פניך
Num VI.25,26
25יאר יהוה פניו אליך ויחנך 26ישא
יהוה פניו אליך וישם לך שלום

Cl LX.3

ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς.

Num VI.25,26

25 ἐπιφάναι κύριος τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ ἐλεῆσαι σε,
26 ἐπάραι κύριος τὸ πρόσωπον αὐταῦ ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δῴη σοι εἰρήνην.

Ps XXXIX.3 etc. Ps XL.3 אשרי τὰ διαβήματά μου / Deut XII.25 LXX adds τὸ καλὸν καί and τοῦ θεαῦ σου from Deut XII.28 / Deut XIII.19 LXX adds τὸ καδν καί from Deut XII.28 / Deut XXI.9 LXX adds τὸ καλὸν καί and τοῦ θεαῦ σου from Deut XII.28.

Ps LXVI.2 etc. Ps LXVII.1 יאר ἐπιφάναι / Ps LXXX.4 האר ἐπίφανον / Num VI.25,26 All verbs(fut.) are rendered in the infinitive. These are translation variants.

CXLIV.8.

Ps XXXIX.3 etc. The expression κατεύθυνον τὰ διαβήματα is found in both Ps XXXIX.3 and Ps CXVIII.133, while I Kgs IX.4 has ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας. The last part of the quotation

Gen L.20, Jer XXI.10, XXIV.6, Amos IX.4, Deut XXX.9	Cl LX.3	Heb.
εἰς ἀγαθά.	εἰς ἀγαθά.	לטבה (לטובה)

Ex VI.1	Cl LX.3	Heb.
ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ κραταιᾷ ἐξαποστελεῖ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐν πραχίονι ὑψηλῷ ἐκβαλεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ.	[εἰς τὸ σκεπασθῆναι ἡμᾶς] τη χειρί σου τῆ κραταιᾷ [καὶ ῥυσθῆναι ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας] τῷ βραχίονί σου τῷ ὑψηλῷ.	כי ביד חזקה ישלחם וביד חזקה יגרשם מארצו

Deut IV.34		
ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ.		וביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה
Deut V.15		
ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ.		ביד חזקה ובזרע נטויה
Jer XXXIX.21		
ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ.		וביד חזקה ובאזרוע נטויה

---

has its parallels in Deut.

Ps LXVI.2 etc. The parallels of this quotation are found in Ps LXVI.2, Ps LXXIX.4,8 and 20. Also cf. Num VI.25,26 and Dan IX.17(θ).

Gen L.20 etc. This expression occurs frequently in the Old Testament. Cl must have been familiar with it.

Ex VI.1 etc. Only τῆ χειρί σου τῆ κραταιᾷ and τῷ βραχίονί σου τῷ ὑψηλῷ are treated as quotations by Li. La mentions only the latter. The combination of χεὶρ κρατία and βραχίων ὑψηλός is a familiar LXX expression.

Ez XX.33.34		Heb.
ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ καὶ		וביד חזקה
ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ.		ובזרוע נטויה

Ps CXLIV.18	Cl LX.4	Heb.
ἐγγὺς κύριος πᾶσιν	ἐπικαλουμένων	קרוב יהוה לכל-קדאיו
ταῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις	[σε αὐτων ὁσίως]	לכל אשר יקראהו
αὐτόν, πᾶσι ταῖς	ἐν πίστει καὶ	באמת
ἐπικαλουμέναις	ἀληθείᾳ.	
αὐτὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.		

Deut XII.25	Cl LXI.2	Heb.
τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν	[τὸ] καλὸν καὶ	הישר בעיני יהוה
ἐναντίον κυρίου ταῦ	εὐάρεστον	
θεαῦ σου.	[ἐνώπιόν σου.]	

Deut XII.28		
τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν		הטוב והישר בעיני
ἐναντίον κυρίου ταῦ		יהוה אלהיך
θεαῦ σου.		

Ex VI.1 etc. Ex VI.1 ביד חזקה 2° ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ / Deut IV.34 ו om. / נטויה ὑψηλῷ / Deut V.15 נטויה ὑψηλῷ / Jer XXXII.21 and Ez XX.33.34 ו om. / נטויה ὑψηλῷ.

Deut XII.25 etc. Deut XII.25 LXX adds τὸ καλὸν καί and ταῦ θεαῦ σου from Deut XII.28.

Ps CXLIV.18 Li is the only edition which treats the word ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ as a quotation. Besides Ps CXLIV.18, cf. also I Tim II.7.

Deut XII.25 etc. La alone treats the words καλὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον as a quotation.

Num XVI.22 (=XXVII.16)	Cl LXIV.1	Heb.
θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός.	δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ κύριος πάσης σαρκός.	אלהי הרוחת לכל-בשר
Deut XIV.2	Cl LXIV.1	Heb.
λαὸν περιούσιον.	εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον.	לעם סגלה

Num XVI.22 etc. LXX adds καί after πνευμάτων.
Deut XIV.2 סגלה is rendered περιούσιον.

Num XVI.22 etc. This quotation is not treated so by any editor, but its parallel passages are found in Num XVI. 22 and XXVII.16.

Deut XIV.2 These words of Cl are treated as a quotation by La alone.

NOTES ON
II. OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN CLEMENT

1. Swete, *Introduction*, p. 382.

2. Some quotations consisting only three or four words have their parallels in many places in the Old Testament. In these cases, it is almost impossible to exhaust all the references. Only several passages are mentioned in this study.

3. Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

4. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I, 107 footnote.

5. See Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 129; melito in Euseb.*H.E.* iv. 26, Clem.Alex.*Protr.* 8, *Strom.* ii.18, and Origen, *Hom.xiv in Gen.* 2.

6. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, II, 167.

7. Skinner, *Genesis*, ICC, p. 107, cf. Kittel.

8. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 78.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 178.

10. Knopf, *Der Erste Clemensbrief*, p. 67.

11. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, Part I, II, 55.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 56.

13. Lake, *op. cit.*, I, 32.

14. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 206.

15. See p. 4 f. above.

16. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, p. 344.

17. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 179.

18. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

19. Driver and Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, II, lxxi.

20. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, Part I, II, 64.

21. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, II, 6.

22. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

23. Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, CB, notes on Psalm LI.18,19.

24. Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms*, p. 231.

25. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, Part I, II, 76.

26. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II, 79.

27. Lake, *op. cit.*, I, 48.

28. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, "ἐξανίστημι."

29. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II, 92-93.

30. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 355,6.

31. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Proverbs*, p. xxxii.

32. Driver and Gray, *op. cit.*, I, lxxi.

33. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, Part I, II, 96-97.

34. Lightfoot, *op. Cit.*, II, 105.

35, Swete, *Introduction*, 46 ff.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

37. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, I, 389 ff.

38. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II, 110.

39. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 30.

40. Driver and Gray, *op. cit.*, I, lxxi.

41. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II, 119.

42. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 179.

43. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II, 146.

44. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 206.

45. Knopf, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*

46. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 207.

47. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, Part I, II, 163-164.

48. Duhm, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

49. Toy, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

50. *Ibid.*

CONCLUSION

The foregoing study offers sufficient material to answer the fundamental question of the textual nature of the Old Testament quotations in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. The question has been answered in part already in the discussion of the individual passages, but here we will draw some general conclusions.

(1) It is beyond doubt that the Old Testament which Clement used was not the Hebrew but the LXX. This is clearly shown by numerous readings in which he agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew (cf. IV.1-6; XV.3; XXX.4,5; etc.). Clement appears to follow the text of LXX-A more often than that of LXX-B, but he diverges from both of them in many places:

LXX-A (X.3; XV.2; XVII.4; XXII.1-8; XXXIV.6;
XXXIX.3-9; L.6; LII.3; LIII.2,3; LVI.3,4)

LXX-B (IV.10; XIV.5; XV.4; XVII.5; XVIII.12-17;
XXVI.2; XXX.4,5; LVI.6-15; LVII.3-7)

He even seems in several cases to go back to the Hebrew (cf. II.8; IV.1-6; XXI.2; XXVIII.3; LVII.3-7), but the discrepancies between Cl and the Hebrew are greater than their similarities. In view of these phenomena, it may be inferred that his LXX text was different from any of our extent MSS, though it was probably close to the readings of A and B.

It may have also lacked Ps L.20-21 (see XVIII.2-17). His quotation of Daniel(Θ) in Cl XXXIV.6 may be explained satisfactorily by the supposition that there was in his time a pre-Christian version of Daniel, passing as "LXX", which later became the basis of Theodotion's revision.

(2) Clement's favorite book of the Old Testament is the Psalms, and nearly one-half of his quotations are taken from this book. This is not surprising, for the Psalms were in use for liturgical purposes from the very beginning of the Church, and were the most familiar and highly esteemed book of the early Christians.

(3) Except for short familiar phrases, the longer the quotation is, the more accurate it is. Clement may have quoted short ones from memory, while he had the Old Testament passages before him when he made long quotations. The quotation accompanied by a formula citandi is generally faithful to the LXX. But when a formula citandi has either που or ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ, the quotation is in most cases inaccurate. Whenever it refers to the names of patriarchs, such as Job, David, and Moses, the quotation is loose or very loose without exception.

(4) Clement uses the Old Testament passages as proof texts, often employing the allegorical method. For instance, he interpretes the scarlet thread of Rahab as the blood of the Lord. He constantly draws lessons from the

Old Testament and applies them to the Christians in Corinth. Therefore he frequently alters the ideas of the Old Testament to suit his context. The most notable example is his interpretation of Job XIX.26. This passage is an enigma of Old Testament exegesis, and is often misunderstood as if it implies the idea of immortality. The LXX makes the passage refer to the restoration of the skin. Clement alters it still further, and draws from it an entirely new and different idea, the resurrection of the body. This habit of changing the ideas of the Old Testament freely to suit one's argument must have been prevalent among the early Christian writers, for Clement of Alexandria appears to do the same in quoting the Old Testament passages through Clement of Rome (see Cl XXXIV.3; XLVIII.2; LII.2).

(5) Although Clement of Rome freely changes both the expression and meaning of the LXX, he is very particular about his copying the word κύριος or ὁ κύριος. Whenever he is not quoting from the LXX, he usually writes the word with the definite article. But in his quotation he is very anxious and careful to copy the word exactly as the LXX has it, with or without the definite article.

(6) Clement appears to quote from Sir and Wis, but since these quotations are not introduced by any formula, we do not know whether he is doing it consciously or not. Cl VIII.3 and XXIX.3 may have been taken from lost apocrypha,

but we have no means of knowing this.

(7) Eleven Old Testament quotations in Clement are also quoted by the New Testament writers. In comparing Clement's text of the LXX and that which appears in the New Testament, we find that, despite their similarity, the former presents sufficient evidence of independence. For instance, the two passages of the New Testament (I Cor I. 31 and II Cor X.17), which resemble Cl XIII.1 better than the LXX Jer IX.22-23, in fact present a parallel only in part. Also a passage of Heb III.2, though closer to Cl XVII.5 than the LXX Num XII.7, still differs a little. The same is true of Acts XIII.22(Cl XVIII.1) and I Cor II.9 (Cl XXXIV.8). Only two New Testament passages agree with Clement verbally: Mt XV.8 = Cl XV.2 and Heb I.7 = Cl XXXVI. 3, but are not sufficient in number for any conclusion to be drawn. Furthermore, Acts VII.27,28 is an exact quotation from the LXX Ex II.14, and both of them differ from Cl IV.10. Acts VII.3 reads ἔξελθε with the LXX Gen XII. 1-3 for ἄπελθε of Clement, and the passage is much shorter than Cl and the LXX, both of which are very similar in the text and length. If Clement were under the influence of the New Testament passage, his quotation would also be shorter than the LXX passage. The same thing can be said of Rom IV.7,8. Here Cl and the LXX Ps XXXI.1,2 are exactly alike in the text and length, thus proving their common

origin. Both passages from Heb I.5(also V.5) and Acts XIII. 33 correspond to a part of Cl XXXVI.4 verbatim, but the LXX Ps II.7,8 presents a better parallel. Therefore the similarity between Cl and the N.T. passages is in general accidental rather than intentional.

(8) As to the text of Clement, the quotations of CS offer harmonistic readings. They are constantly correcting the text from the LXX (cf. IV, XIII, XXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XLVII, LIII, etc.). Cl-C has a strange chracteristic of cutting off the latter part of the quotations, cf. LII.2, LII.3 and XVIII.2-17.

(9) The studies of Hatch and Swete on the Old Testament quotation of Clement are partial and superficial. Especially the list of the quotations given by the latter in his *Introduction* should be corrected and supplemented (cf. p. 42 f. above).

(10) There are eight quotations which may be called composite:

Cl	*O.T. passages*	*Degree of accuracy*
XIV.5	Prov II.21,22+Ps XXXVI.38(?)	P
XVII.5	Ex III.11+Ez IV.10	Lf
XXII.1-8	Ps XXXI.10+Ps XXXIII.12-18,20	E
XXIII.5	Is XIII.22+Mal III.1b,c	Lf
XXXIV.6	Dan VII.10(θ)+Is VI.3	E
XXXIX.3-9	Job IV.16-18+XV.15+IV.19-V.5	E
LII.3	Ps XLIX.14,15+L.19	E
LVI.3,4	Ps CXVII.18+Prov III.12	E

No particular book or books seems to have been preferred by Clement for such quotations. Hatch maintains that the composite quotations in the early Christian writings proves the existence of a book of Testimonies among the Greek-speaking Jews of the dispersion (see p. 4 f. above). That such collections might have existed is quite possible, and no definite proof may be produced against it. But whether the composite quotations in Clement are relics of such excerpts or not is another question. Some phases of these strings of citations are hardly to be accounted for by Hatch's supposition (see p. 78 f. above).

(11) All the modern editors of Clement of Rome overlooked the omission of the words ἢ ὅταν ἔρχηται ὑμῖν ὄλεθρος in the text of Clement (LVII.4), and say nothing about it in their notes. This transcriptional error owing to homoeoarkton must have taken place very early, for all the authorities for the text of Cl omit these words.

(12) The following are the Old Testament passages which are quoted by both Clement of Rome and Clement of Alexandria:

Cl	*ClAlex*
VIII.2	*de div. Servando* 39
VIII.3	*Quis dives Salvetur* 39
	*Paedag.*I.10
XV.5	*Strom.*IV.VI.33
XV.5-7	*Strom.*IV.VI.33
XXVIII.3	*Strom.*IV.22

XXXIV.3	*Strom.*IV.22
XXXIV.8	*Ep. ad Virg.*I.9
XXXV.7-12	*Strom.*VI
	*Strom.*I.VIII
LIII.2,3	*Strom.*IV.XIX
LIII.4	*Strom.*IV.XIX
LVI.3,4	*Paed.*I.9
LVII.3-7	*Strom.*II.XXII; II.VIII; IV.XXIII

In most cases Clement of Alexandria is quoting Clement of Rome, and is not an independent authority for the text of the LXX. Furthermore, it is probable that he cites chiefly from memory, and this must be borne in mind in using his quotations to correct the text of Clement of Rome. He often improves the Greek of the latter (cf. XXXIV.3 = *Strom.*IV.22).

(13) Clement does not derive his quotations directly from Hebrews, for he adds other passages which are wanting in the latter (cf. XXXVI.4 and LVI.3,4). But it is probable that he is under the influence of Hebrews both in his use of a similar group of passages and in his interpretation of them in chapter XXXVI. Thus the quotations add to the probability that Clement used the Epistle to the Hebrews.

QUOTATIONS AND THEIR CHRACTERISTICS

(Legend)

Column for length: S = short; VS = very short; L = long; VL = very long.

Column for accuracy: L = loose; VL = very loose; E = exact or nearly exact; P = probably; f = fusion.

Cl	OT passage	Composite	Length	Agreement with LXX MS	Form. cit.	Accuracy	NT	Agreement with MT	Apocrypha	Greek improved	Idea changed
II.8	Prov VII. 8b		VS		–	L		+			+
III.1	Deut XXXII 15		S		+	VL					
III.8	Is III.5.		S		–	VL					
III.4	Is LIX.14		VS		–	VL					
III.4	Wis II.24		VS		–	E			+		
IV.1-6	Gen IV.3-8		S		+	E		+		+	
IV.10	Ex II.14		L	B	–	E					
VI.3	Gen II.28		VS		–	E					
VIII.2	Ez XXXIII.11		S		+	P				+	
VIII.8	Ez XVIII.80 f. Ez XXXIII.11		S		–	VL			?		
VIII.4	Is I.16-20		L		+	E				+	
X.8	Gen XII.1-8		S	A	+	E				+	
X.4,5	Gen XIII.14-16		S		+	E					
X.6	Gen XV.5-6		S		+	E				+	
XIII.1	Jer IX.22, 28		S		+	P	+			+	
XIII.4	Is LXVI.2		S		+	E					
XIV.4	Prov II.21,22 Ps XXXVI.38	?	S		+	P				+	
XIV.5	Ps XXXVI.35-37		S	B	+	E				+	
XV.2	Is XXIX.18		S	A	+	E	+				

Cl	OT passage	Composite	Length	Agreement with LXX MS	Form. cit.	Accuracy	NT	Agreement with MT	Apocrypha	Greek improved	Idea changed
XV.3	Ps LXI.5		VS		+	E				+	
XV.4	Ps LXXVII. 36,37		S	B	+	E				+	
XV.5.	Ps XXX.19		S		−	E					
XV.5-7	Ps XI.4-6		L		+	E				+	
XVI.3 -14	Is LIII.1-12		VL		+	E				+	
XVI. 15-16	Ps XXI.7-9		L		+	E					
XVII. 2	Gen XVIII. 27		VS		−	E					
XVII. 3	Job I.1		S		+	L					
XVII. 4	Job XIV.4, 5a		VS	A	−	VL					
XVII. 5	Num XII.7		VS		−	L	+				
XVII. 5.	Ex III.11, Ex IV.10	Ex+Ex	VS	B	−	Lf					
XVII. 6	I Ch XXIX. 15(Syr.)?		VS		−	L					
XVIII 1	Ps LXXX-VIII.21		S		+	L	+				
XVIII 12-17	Ps L.3-19		VL	B	+	E					
XX.6	Gen I.9		VS		−	E					
XX.7	Job XXX-VIII.11		VS		+	VL					+
XXI.2	Prov XX.27		VS		+	L		+			+
XXII. 1-8	Ps XXXI.10 Ps XXXIII. 12-18,20	Ps+Ps +Ps	L	A	+	E				+	
XXIII 5	Is XIII.22 Mal III. 1b,c	Is+ Mal	S		+	Lf					
XXVI. 2	Ps LXX.21c 22b		VS	B	+	VL					
XXVI. 2	Ps III.6 Ps XXII.4		VS		−	Lf					
XXVI. 3	Job XIX.26		S		+	VL					+
XXVII 5	Wis XII.12		S		−	Lf			+		
XXVII 7	Ps XVIII. 2-4		S		−	E					

Cl	OT passage	Composite	Length	Agreement with LXX MS	Form. cit.	Accuracy	NT	Agreement with MT	Apocrypha	Greek improved	Idea changed
XXVIII.3	Ps CXXXVIII 7.10		S		+	L		+			+
XXIX.2	Deut XXXII. 8,9		S		+	E					
XXIX.3	Deut IV.34 etc.?		S		+	VL			?		
XXX.2	Prov III.34		S		+	E	+				
XXX.4,5	Job XI.2,3		S	B	+	E				+	
XXXII.2	Gen XV.5		VS		+	L					
XXXIII.5	Gen I.26,27		S		+	E					
XXXIII.6	Gen I.28		VS		+	E					
XXXIV.3	Is XL.10 Is LXII.11 Prov XXIV. 12		S		+	VL?					
XXXIV.6	Dan VII.10 (θ) Is VI.3	Dan+ Is	S	A	+	E	+?				+
XXXIV.8	Is LXIV.3		S		+	L?	+			+	
XXXV.7-12	Ps XLIX.16 -23		L	S	+	E				+	
XXXVI.3	Ps CIII.4		S		+	E	+				
XXXVI.4	Ps II.7,8		S		+	E	+				
XXXVI.5	Ps CIX.1		S		+	E	+				
XXXIX. 8-9	Job IV.16-18,XV.15, IV.19-V.5	Job+ Job+ Job	L	A	+	E				+	
XLII.5	Is LX.17		S		+	L					+
XLIII.1	Num XII.7		VS		–	L					
XLVI.3	Ps XVII. 26b-27		S		+	E					+
XLVIII.2	Ps CXVII. 19,20		S		+	E				+	
L.4	Is XXVI. 20, Ez XXXVII.12		S		+	VL			?		
L.6	Ps XXXI.1,2		S	A	+	E					
LI.4	Num XVI.33 Ps XLVIII. 15		S		–	VL					
LI.5	Ex XIV.28 etc.		VS		–	E					
LII.2	Ps LXVIII. 31-33		S		+	L					

Cl	OT passage	Composite	Length	Agreement with LXX MS	Form. cit.	Accuracy	NT	Agreement with MT	Apocrypha	Greek improved	Idea changed
LII.3	Ps XLIX.14 15; L.19	Ps+Ps	S	A	+	E					
LIII.2,3	Deut IX.12 -14		L	A	+	E				+	
LIII.4	Ex XXXII.31,32		S		+	L					
LIV.3	Ps XXIII.1		VS		–	E					
LVI.3,4	Ps CXVII.18 Prov III.12	Ps+ Prov	S	A	+	E	+				
LVI.5	Ps CXL.5		S		+	E					
LVI.6-15	Job V.17-26		L	B	+	E				+	
LVII.3-7	Prov I.23-33		L	B	+	E		+		+	
LIX.3	Is LVII.15		VS		–	VL					
LIX.3	Is XIII.11		VS		–	L					
LIX.3	Ps XXXII.10		VS		–	VL					
LIX.3	Job V.11 Is X.33		VS		–	VL					
LIX.3	Deut XXXII 39		VS		–	VL					
LIX.4	Ps CXVIII.114		VS		–	VL					
LIX.4	I Kgs VIII 60 etc.		VS		–	VL					
LIX.4	Ps XCIX.3 XCIV.7 LXXVIII.13		VS		–	VL					
LX.1	Joel II.13 II Ch XXX.9; Sir II.11		VS		–	VL					
LX.2	Ps XXXIX.3 etc.		VS		–	VL					
LX.3	Ps XVI.2 etc.		VS		–	VL					
LX.3	Gen L.20 etc.		VS		–	E?					
LX.3	Ex VI.1 etc.		VS		–	VL					
LX.4	Ps CXLIV.18		VS		–	VL					
LXI.2	Deut XII.25(28)		VS		–	VL					
LXIV.1	Num.XVI.22		VS		–	VL					
LXIV.1	Deut.XIV.2		VS		–	E?					

FORMULA CITANDI AND DEGREE OF ACCURACY

L = loose; VL = very loose;
E = exact or nearly exact;
P = probably; f = fusion.

Cl	d.a.	formula citandi
III.1	VL	ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον
IV.1	E	γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως
XXXVI.3	E	" " "
VIII.2	P	ἐλάλησεν μετὰ ὅρκου
VIII.4	E	ἐν ἑτέῳ τόπῳ λέγει οὕτως
X.3	E	λέγει γὰρ αὐτῷ
X.4	E	εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός
X.6	E	πάλιν λέγει
XIV.5	E	" "
XV.4	E	" "
LVI.6-15	E	" "
XIII.1	P	ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον, λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον
XIII.4	E	φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος
XIV.4	P	γέγραπται γάρ
XXXIX.3-9	E	" "
L.4	VL	" "
L.6	E	" "
XV.2	E	λέγει γάρ που
XXI.2	L	" " "
XXVI.2	VL	" " "
XV.3	E	καὶ πάλιν
XV.5,6	E	" "
XVI.3-14	E	φησὶν γάρ
XVI.15,16	E	καὶ πάλιν αὐτός φησιν
XVII.3	L	περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτως γέγραπται
XVIII.1	L	εἶπεν ὁ θεός
XVIII.2-17	E	καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει πρὸς τὸν θεόν
XX.7	VL	εἶπεν γάρ
XXII.1-8	E	οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς

Cl	d.a	formula citandi
XXIII.5	Lf	συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς
XXVI.3	VL	πάλιν Ἰὼβ λέγει
XXVIII.3	L	λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖον
XXIX.2	E	οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται
XXIX.3	VL	ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει
XXX.2	E	φησίν
LVI.5	E	"
XXXII.2	L	ὡς ἐπαγγειλαμένου τοῦ θεοῦ
XXX.4,5	E	λέγει γάρ
XXXIV.8	L?	" "
XXXIII.5	E	οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ θεός
XXXIII.6	E	καὶ εἶπεν
XXXIV.3	VLf	προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν
XXXIV.6	E	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή
XXXV.7	E	" " " "
XXXVI.4	E	οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης
XXXVI.5	E	πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν
XLII.5	L	οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή
XLVI.3	E	πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει
XLVIII.2	E	καθῶς γέγραπται
LII.2	L	φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δαυείδ
LII.3	E	καὶ πάλιν λέγει
LIII.2,3	E	εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ θεός
LIII.4	L	καὶ εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς
LVI.3,4	E	οὕτως γάρ φησιν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος
LVII.3-7	E	οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bardenhewer, Otto. *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur.* Vol. I. 2d ed. Freiburg, 1913. Pp. 116-130.

Barrois, R. P. A. "Une Noubelle Théorie de l'origine des Septante," *Revue Biblique*, XXXIX (1930), 332-361.

Bartlet, J. V., *et al. The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.* Oxford, 1905.

Bauer, Walter. *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* 3d ed. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936.

Bensly, R. L. *The Epistles of S. Clement to the Corinthians in Syriac.* Cambridge, 1899.

Briggs, C. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms (ICC).* Vol. I. New York: Scribners, 1906.

Brooke, A. E., McLean, N., and Thackeray, H. St. John (ed.). *The Old Testament in Greek.* Vol. I, Part I - Vol. II, Part IV. London: Cambridge University Press, 1906-1935.

Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* Vol. I, *Apocrypha.* Oxford, 1913.

Cayré, F. *Manual of Patrology and History of Theology.* Vol. I. Philadelphia, 1935. Pp. 52-61.

Chapman, John. "Clement I," *Catholic Encyclopedia.* New York: Appleton, 1910.

Cheyne, T. K. *The Book of Psalms.* Vol. I. New York, 1904.

Clarke, W. K. L. (ed.). *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.* London: Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937.

Clementis Alexandrini Opera. Vol. II, *Stromatum I - IV,* Vol. III, *Stromatum V - VIII. Scripta Minora. Fragmenta.* Oxford, 1869.

Cruttwell, C. T. *A Literary History of Early Christianity.* Vol. I. London, 1893. Pp. 21-39.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Bible Studies.* Edinburgh, 1901.

Delitzsch, F. *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.* Authorized Translation from the Third Edition by James Denney. 2 vols. New York (The date of publication is not indicated).

Dibelius, Martin. *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature.* Hertford, 1936.

Donaldson, James. *The Apostolic Fathers.* London: Macmillan, 1874. Pp. 113-190.

Donehoo, J. R. *The New Testament View of the Old Testament.* Philadelphia, 1900.

Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy (ICC).* New York: Scribners, 1895.

Driver, S. R., and Gray, G. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job.* 2 vols. New York: Scribners, 1921.

Duhm, B. *Das Buch Hiob. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament.* Leipzig and Tübingen, 1897.

-------. *Die Psalmen. Kurzer Hand- Commentar zum Alten Testament.* Leipzig and Tübingen, 1899, 1920.

Eusebius, Pamphilus. *The Ecclesiastical History.* Translated by C. F. Crusé. London, 1879.

Gebhardt, O. D., and Harnack, A. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera.* Vol. I. Leipzig, 1876.

Gebhardt, O. D., Harnack, A., and Zahn, T. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera.* Small Edition. Leipzig, 1906.

Gilbert, G. H. *Interpretation of the Bible: A Short History.* New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 88-91.

Goodspeed, E. J. *Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum.* Leipzig, 1907.

---------------. *An Introduction to the New Testament.* Chicago, 1937. Pp. 257 f.

Gray, G. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah (ICC).* Vol. I. New York: Scribners, 1912.

Grieve, A. J. and Robinson, J. A. "Clement," *Encyclopedia Britannica.* 11th ed. Cambridge, 1910.

Harnack, Adolf. *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius.* Leipzig, 1893.

--------------. *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius.* Vol. I. Leipzig, 1897.

Harris, J. R. "On an obscure Quotation in the First Epistle of Clement," *Journal of Biblical Literature.* XXIX (1910), 190-195.

------------. *Testimonies.* Part I. Cambridge, 1916.

Hatch, Edwin. *Essays in Biblical Greek.* Oxford, 1889.

Hatch, E., and Redpath, H.A. *A Concordance to the Septuagint.* 8 vols. Oxford, 1892-1906.

Hefele, C. I. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera.* 4th ed. Tübingen, 1855.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Die Apostolischen Väter.* Halle, 1853.

Jackson, G. A. *The Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists of the Second Century.* New York: Appleton, 1879.

Johnson, Franklin. *The quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature.* Philadelphia, 1896.

Johnston, J. B. "The Date of the Septuagint," *ET.* XIII (May, 1902), 382.

Josephus, Flavius. *The Antiquities of the Jews.* Book X, 5, 1. Translated by William Whiston. Edinburgh (The date of publication is not indicated).

Jülicher, A., and Fascher, E. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* 7th ed. Tübingen, 1931. Pp. 142-161.

Kaufman, Judah Ibn-Shmuel (ed.). *English-Hebrew Dictionary.* Tel-Aviv, Palestine, 1929.

Kirkpatrick, A. F. *The Book of Psalms.* The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, 1895.

Knopf, Rudolf. *Der Erste Clemensbrief. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Tübingen, 1920.

Kittel, Rudolf. *Biblia Hebraica.* 2 vols. Privilegierte Württenburgisch Bibelanstalt, 1925.

Krüger, G. *History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries.* New York, 1897. Pp. 21 f.

Lake, Kirsopp. *The Apostolic Fathers.* 2 vols. New York, 1912.

Lake, Kirsopp and Lake, Silva. *An Introduction to the New Testament.* New York and London, 1937. Pp. 158 f.

Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part I, Vol. I and II. New York and London, 1890.

---------------. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Revised Texts, edited and compiled by J. R. Harmer. London, 1907.

McCown, C. C. *The Promise of His Coming.* New York, 1921. p. 237.

McNeile, A. H. *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.* Oxford, 1927. Pp. 223 ff.

Marsh, F. S. "Epistle of Clement of Rome," *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.* Vol. I. New York, Scribners, 1916.

Merrill, E. T. *Essays in Early Christian History.* London, 1924.

Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.* New York, Scribners, 1915. Pp. 451 f.

-------------. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* New York: Scribners, 1924. Pp. xiii-xxx.

Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Books of the Apocrypha.* London, 1915.

----------------. *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha.* New York: Macmillan, 1935. Pp. 177 ff.

Ottley, R. R. *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus).* 2 vols. 2d ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1909.

Pfleiderer, Otto. *Primitive Christianity: Its Writings and Teachings in their Historical Connections.* Vol. IV. New York and London, 1910. Pp. 341 ff.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta.* 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1935.

Redpath, H. A. "A Contributing towards settling the Date of the Translation of the Various Books of the Septuagint," *Journal of Biblical Literature.* VII (1906), 606-615.

Roberts, A., and Donaldson, J. *Ante-Nicene Christian Library.* Vol. I, *The Apostolic Fathers.* Edinburgh, 1873.

---------------------------. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers.* 10 vols. Buffalo, 1885.

Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. II, *Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100-225*. Revised ed. New York, 1884. Pp. 636 ff.

Scott, E. F. *The Literature of the New Testament*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1932. Pp. 199.

Skinner, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis (ICC)*. New York: Scribners, 1910.

-------------. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1898.

Stählin, Otto. *Clemens Alexandrinus (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte)*. Vol. I, III, and IV. Leipzig, 1909, 1936.

Stählin, O., and Schmid, W. *Geschichte der Griechischen Litterature*. Part II, Vol. I. München, 1920.

Swete, H. B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge, 1902.

-----------. *The Old Testament in Greek*. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1887.

Thackeray, H. St. John. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins*. London, 1921.

Torrey, C. C. *The Second Isaiah - A New Interpretation*. New York: Scribners, 1928.

Toy, C. H. *Quotations in the New Testament*. New York: Scribners, 1884.

---------. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs (ICC)*. New York: Scribners, 1899.

Uhlhorn, G. "Clemens von Rom," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1898.

Vőlter, D. "Bemerkungen zum 1. Clemensbrief," *ZNW*, 1906. Pp. 261-264.

Wade, G. W. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah.* Westminster Commentaries. London, 1911.

Wendland, Paul. *Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Tübingen, 1912.

Windisch, Hans. *Der Hebräerbrief. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Tübingen, 1913.

INDEX

(Patristic and Biblical Passages)

Note: For a list of O.T. passages quoted in Cl, see p. 27 f.

		Page
Gen	I. 22	109
	VIII. 17	109
	IX. 1, 7	109
	XII. 1-3	3
	XVIII. 27	3
	XXII. 17	108
	XXVI. 4	108
Ex	II. 4, 13	3
	III. 10	88
	XXXII. 7.10	132
Num	XVIII. 27	106
Deut	XXVIII. 46	67
Jos	IV. 7	67
I Sam	XIII. 14b	90
II Sam	XXIII. 1	90
I Kgs	XX. 15	67
II Kgs	VII. 25	67
II Ch	XXXI. 14	106
Ps	VII. 3	117
	XXXI. 1,2	4
	XXXVI. 35-37	4
	XLV. 16-23	4
	L. 3-19	4
	LVII. 2	116
	LXI. 5	4
	LXXI. 20	90
	XCIV. 20	116
	CII. 11 f.	60
	CII. 10,11	61
Prov	VII. 3	52

Page
Is I. 18 . . . . 60, 62
XVI. 1,2 5
XXIX. 13 . . . . 4, 28
LIV. 8 90
LX. 17 4
Jer II. 12,13 5
III. 19,22 . . . . 60, 61
Ez XVIII. 30 f. 60
XLVIII. 12 106
Wis XI. 21 101
Mt XV. 8 . . . . 23, 73
XXII. 44 119
XXIII. 12 143
Mk VII. 6 . . . . 28, 73
XII. 36 119
Lk XIV. 11 143
XVIII. 14 143
XX. 43 119
Acts VII. 27-28 59
XIII. 22 90
XIII. 33 118
Rom III. 10-18 5
IV. 7,8 126
V. 12 55
I Cor I. 31 68
II. 9 . . . . 113, 114
II. Cor III. 3 51
X. 17 68
Eph I. 19 102
VI. 10 102
Heb I. 5 118
I. 7 117
I. 13 119
III. 2 87
III. 5 123
V. 5 118
XII. 5-6 133

Page
Jam IV. 6 106
I Pet V. 5 106
Rev III. 19 134

Ambros. *Hexaem.* 6.7 3
Antonius Melissa
Loci Communes ii.73 33
Apost. Const. 11 142
Barnabas I. 3 26
XI. 2,3 5
XVII. 2 26
XX. 2 54
Basil of Caesarea
De Spirit. Sanct. 29 31
Clement of Alexandria
Strom. i.7.38 29, 124
" ii.8 140
" ii.22 140
" iv.6.32,33 29, 73
77, 78
" iv.14 116
" iv.17-19,105-121 30
" iv.17.112 30
" iv.19 130, 131, 132
" iv.18 140
" iv.22 104, 110
" v.12.81 30
" vi.8.64 30, 124
de div. Servando 39 60
Quis dives salvatur 39 62
Paedag. I.10 62
Ep. ad Virg. I.9 115
II Cl III. 5 28
XI. 7 115
XIV. 5 115

Page
Cyril. *Hier. Catech.* XV.24 111
Didymus of Alexandria
Expos. in Psalm.cxxxviii 31
Epiphan. *Haeres.* 23.1,5 3
Eusebius *H.E.,* III.16 . . . . 9, 16
" IV.23 16
Praep.En. vii.15 111
Georgius Hamartolus
Chron. i.9 33
Greg. Nyss. *Hom.viii in Eccles.* 111
Hermas *Vis.* II.4.3 27
Ignatius *Polyc.* V 27
Ephes. XV 27
Iren. *i.praef* 3 51
*Haer.*ii.7,4 111
John of Damascus
*Parallela Vaticana,*a.viii 32
Justin *Dial.* 20 53
" 56.1 . . . . 28, 123
" 78 75
" 111 28
Tryph. 18 64
" 27 5
" 114 5
Apol. 44 64
" 61 64
Leontius and Joannes
*Sacrarum Reum Lib.*ii 32
Letter of Smyrnaeans 28
Mart. Polyc. II.3 115
Maximus the Confessor
Sermo 47 32
Origen *de Princip.* ii.3.6 30
*Select.in Ezech.*viii.3 31
*in Joann.*13.28 3

Page

Tertullian *de Carn.Christ* 23 63

Theophilus *Ad.Autol.* ii.29 55

GTU Library
3 2400 00687 0285

LIBRARY USE ONLY